

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—JANUARY, 1892.—No. 65.

NATIONALISM, THE CONCLAVE AND THE NEXT
POPE.

FOR a long time past there have been, on both sides of the ocean, on the continent of Europe especially, periodical outbursts of a feverish and most untimely curiosity regarding the nationality of the immediate successor of Leo XIII., regarding the place where the next conclave would be at liberty to assemble, as well as the degree of pressure which the great powers would bring to bear upon the electors, members of the Sacred College.

What is most to be regretted in these discussions, so untimely under present political circumstances, and so indelicate while the Holy Father is so heroically bearing up against the enormous fatigues of his office and the increasing difficulties of his position, is to see Catholics manifesting more anxiety regarding the nationality of the next Pope than the freedom of the conclave, or the conditions of greater liberty or greater servitude awaiting him.

We shall consult the desire of both the Protestant and the Catholic public by giving at once categorical answers to the following questions, which are uppermost in the minds of our readers, and continue to be warmly discussed all over the Christian world:

“Where will the next conclave be held?”

“Of what nationality will be the Pope there chosen?”

“Will the next Pope continue to reside in Rome?”

I.

There is not the faintest likelihood, save in the sole event of a general European war, that the next conclave can or will be held

outside of Rome. On the contrary, every probability, every consideration of political wisdom point to the moral certainty that the conclave will take place in the Eternal City, protected from all violence and pressure by the Italian government. The "Law of Guarantees," passed by the Italian Parliament to secure to the Popes freedom in the discharge of their office while continuing to reside in Rome, also promises to protect the Sacred College while performing its functions as an electoral body. Just, then, as it is of the greatest possible interest for the Italian kingdom that none but a native of Italy shall succeed Leo XIII., even so is it the interest of King, Ministers and Parliament to take every possible measure to induce the cardinals to hold the conclave in Rome, and to surround the deliberations of the Electoral College with even greater guarantees of security and freedom from outside pressure or threats of Radical violence, than in February, 1878.

People must not be misled by the action of the Italian Government on the occasion of the disturbances which took place in Rome during the late visit of the French pilgrims, and of the anti-papal demonstrations encouraged or tolerated by the civil authorities throughout the cities of Italy. Persons who have closely studied the politico-religious situation in the Peninsula, and who are also well informed about the sentiments entertained toward the Church and the Holy See by the Great Powers and other European Governments, are well aware that Umberto I. and his cabinet are heartily tired of the daily difficulties and dangers created for the new kingdom by the Piedmontese usurpation, and their continued presence in the City of the Popes. That the sects,—which, like the Furies and Fates of old, pursue the usurpers, fill them with terror, and urge them to commit or to wink at further crimes—would willingly annihilate in Italy the Papacy and every vestige of Catholicism, is what the whole world knows. But swift on this consummation of their designs, or even on the violent expulsion of the Pope and the Curia from Italy, would come the long-wished-for reign of the Radical Revolution, and such a Reign of Terror as would throw into the shade the bloody deeds of Danton and Robespierre, of St. Just and Carrière.

King Umberto and the Marquis di Rudini know this well, and though it may not be any love of the Papacy which impels them to protect the Pope and secure him something like freedom in the discharge of his ecumenical office, they are forced to do so by the instinct of self-preservation. The security of the Pope in the Vatican is the sole pledge of the existence in the Quirinal of the Savoyard Dynasty.

Now let us see on what grounds rests the certainty that Italy will protect the next meeting of the conclave in Rome.

Immediately after the death of Pius IX. it became, among the thirty-eight cardinals present in Rome, a subject of earnest inquiry as to whether the conclave should be held in Rome or not. Pius IX. had left behind him a decree authorizing the Sacred College to depart from the constitutions of his predecessors, to hold the conclave wherever, under the circumstances, they would be assured of perfect liberty, and to deviate as well from other formalities in so far as such deviation was needful. In a first meeting of the thirty-eight cardinals, and acting under the fear of violence or disturbance from the outside if they held the election in Rome, thirty of their number voted to hold the conclave outside of Rome or of Italy, only eight declaring in favor of Rome. All this, however, was done in ignorance of the accord to which Italy and the powers had come to secure the full liberty of the conclave if held in Rome. The majority inclined, with Cardinal Franchi, who had been formerly Nuncio at Madrid, to hold the conclave in Spain. The Spanish ambassador, informed of this resolution, at once told Cardinal Franchi that the Spanish government declined to give the cardinals hospitality. Cardinal Manning, who had voted with the majority, nevertheless openly told such of them as wished to hold the conclave in Malta, that he had no reason to believe that the Governor of that island would or could grant them the desired permission. So the next day, finding that they could not count on any of the European governments in this emergency, and reassured by the discourse of the Sub-Dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal di Pietro, who presided at their deliberations, and who was in the confidence of the Cabinet of the Quirinal, the cardinals changed their votes, and a formal secret ballot having taken place, all but five voted to hold the conclave in Rome.

It is now a well known fact, that if the Sacred College had decided to go outside of Italy for the conclave, the Italian government had given orders to escort them in safety, and with all the honors due to their station, to the frontiers of the kingdom. Had they determined to meet in conclave in any other city of Italy but Rome, the government had instructed the civil and military authorities everywhere to secure their deliberations against every possible disturbance. At the same time, however, it was the fixed resolve of the King and his Ministers to take possession of the Vatican, the very moment the cardinals would have left Rome. This determination had been communicated to Cardinal di Pietro.

The government of King Umberto hold themselves pledged to the Cabinets of Europe, to the Catholic courts in particular, to make it more than ever perfectly safe for the Papal Electors to meet in Rome after the death of the present Pope. More than ever will it be the policy of the Quirinal to prove to the world

that the conclave shall enjoy greater liberty under the flag of Savoy, than when Rome, at the death of the last Pope, was turned by the Catholic powers into a hot-bed of intrigue, and all manner of moral pressure was brought to bear by the courts on their respective cardinals.

Ever since the election of Leo XIII. the Italian government and its apologists have pointed with justifiable pride to the conclave which elected him as contrasting most favorably with all similar assemblies in the past, and as a precedent which the new kingdom is disposed to follow in the future. Assuredly it is their interest to fulfil the pledge thus given and the expectations of the Catholic world founded upon it. No less sure is it that any effective attempt of the Sacred College to hold a conclave outside of Italy will be the signal for the troops of King Umberto to enter the Vatican and to hang the Italian tricolor from the Papal apartments and St. Peter's.

These are considerations which the members of the Sacred College, venerable as they are for their enlightened wisdom, their long experience in dealing with the highest interests of the Church, and their tried love and fidelity to the cause of Christ, will not fail to weigh well in the balance of the sanctuary.

As we are about to conclude this article (October 22, 1891), the *New York Herald* brings us from Rome the intelligence that in consequence of the violent demonstrations against the Pope, which occurred on the occasion of the late French pilgrimages, the cardinals are again deliberating about the necessity of leaving Rome at once, and "about the locality of the next conclave, and whether the Pope should take steps to establish a *modus vivendi* with the Quirinal. No decision was arrived at. The Italian government has assured the Pope that nothing should occur to disturb the tranquillity of the Holy See, but that it must be understood that there was no intention to modify the law of guarantees."

Whether the Holy Father does or not contemplate seriously the necessity of leaving Rome; whether the Sacred College has been asked to deliberate on the safest place to hold the next conclave, and whether any advances toward a *modus vivendi* have been authorized or made to the Cabinet of the Quirinal, are facts which we have at present no means of verifying. That in the very first days of his Pontificate, Leo XIII. summoned Cesare Cantu to Rome to concert with Cardinal Franchi a *modus vivendi* between the Pontifical and the Italian governments, is a fact for which the writer of this paper has the authority of the venerable author of *La Storia Universale*. In a letter dictated from his sick-bed in 1882 and directed to the writer, then at Vigo, Cantu relates how overjoyed he was to answer the Pope's summons, and how every-

thing promised fairly for this first attempt at conciliation, when Cardinal Franchi suddenly died. Cardinal Nina, who succeeded him as Secretary of State, was of a different way of thinking, and so the Pope did not pursue his purpose. Is it possible that Leo XIII. contemplates, after well-nigh fourteen years of conflict with the Revolutionary forces enthroned at Rome, to seek, once for all, what he deemed necessary when first raised to the Chair of Peter?

Be that as it may, the Italian government is only complying with a political necessity and the dictates of a true statesmanlike wisdom, when it repeats to the Vatican the assurance that the Pontifical government shall be protected from revolutionary violence and that the Law of Guarantees shall remain unchanged.

We are only recalling these assurances here to show that the present masters of Rome are not willing that the Pope should seek an asylum outside of Italy, or that the Sacred College should entertain the thought of holding a conclave anywhere else than in the palace of the Popes. That the king and his ministers are not sorry to frighten away from Rome these imposing crowds of French pilgrims, or to allow the anti-clerical clubs of Rome to show the Pope and the cardinals what religion might expect, if the strong hand of the government were paralyzed or withdrawn—this conduct would be consistent with the past. It is a part of the Piedmontese policy to force the Holy Father to conciliate and to effect a *modus vivendi*.

But so long as there is no European war arraying France against Italy, so long as Italy is left in peace to rule Rome as she now does, it may be regarded as an inviolable rule of Italian state policy that no pains shall be spared to protect the Papal electors while choosing a new Pope, and to surround the latter with the safeguards stipulated in the Law of Guarantees. The last conclave was protected by the Depretis-Crispi ministry. The Parliamentary party represented by the Marquis de Rudini could not be less earnest in their desire to carry out the law faithfully.

We have said that a European war might render the stay of the Pope in Rome so unsafe as to justify, in the opinion of his councillors, or to necessitate his abandoning the Eternal City, and asking a temporary asylum from some friendly power. Even then such a step would only be advisable, when the Italian government had declared to the Vatican that it could not guarantee the Holy Father's safety or that of the cardinals against the tide of Radical passions and masonic hatred let loose by war. Then it would be the policy as well as the interest and duty of the Quirinal to help provide the Pope with a safe retreat while the war lasted, to use its kind offices for that purpose with a friendly country; to

prevent the Vatican and St. Peter's, as well as the Pontifical palaces, etc., from falling into the hands of the mob. We are thus dealing with a position in which King Umberto and his government were yielding to the irresistible force of circumstances, facilitating the stay abroad of the Papal government, and looking forward to the time when they might safely encourage its return to Rome.

This is taking what many will judge to be an optimistic view of an extreme situation and of the disposition of the rulers of Rome and Italy. But there is the other view, with its near probabilities, and the fearful realities it suggests, that in which we suppose the anti-clerical clubs throughout the Italian Peninsula to be the controlling force there while a European war lasted.

II.

The same weighty considerations which compel all serious-minded men, all Catholics who set the good of the Church above national feelings and preferences, to see that there can be, as things are at present, no question of holding a conclave outside of Rome and the palace of the Vatican, must also lead them to the conclusion that the next Pope should be, like the present Holy Father, a native of Italy. It is strange to read in the great daily organs of public opinion here as well as in Europe, the speculations which the editors and their correspondents indulge in with regard to the nationality of Leo XIII.'s immediate successor. The public mind, on the European Continent particularly has been long preoccupied with prophecies on this untoward subject; so much so, indeed, that one of the foremost publicists in Italy, R. di Cesare, printed in 1888 a large octavo volume of 623 pages, containing a history of the conclave which elected Leo XIII., and a pamphlet in nine chapters on the next conclave. This remarkably clever book has afforded to the speculators of the press a seemingly exhaustless theme. Catholic writers, like numberless others, have kept up the excitement by foretelling the election of a French or German Pope, of an English or an American Pope, and by seeing or pretending to see in such a choice, an earnest of the restoration of the Pope's temporal sovereignty. The names of the cardinals thus likely to be elected were and are still repeatedly mentioned. And no reader of these oracular announcements can be more astonished at their extravagance than the eminent prelates thus unwarrantably singled out for the most unenviable of distinctions.

Save only in the case mentioned above, when, during a European war, the conclave would assemble outside of Italy, could the electors have any motive to choose a Pope not an Italian, as a compliment to the country affording them hospitality. But on

weighing all the reasons which must influence the votes of the Sacred College, reasons of general and permanent ecclesiastical policy, not of passing and local expediency, one is forced to come back to the belief that the rule governing Papal elections will prevail—and none but an Italian Pope shall fill the seat left vacant by the Thirteenth Leo.

We are now assuming that the next conclave will be held in Rome, and that the Italian government will keep to their solemn pledges of protecting the electors. We are also assuming that the election will take place while Europe is enjoying peace. Now, to arrive at a just conclusion as to the wishes of the great powers regarding the nationality of Leo XIII.'s successor, let us examine the officially expressed wishes of these same powers before the conclave of February, 1878.

The sole anxiety of the Piedmontese government, after pledging themselves to secure the freedom of the Electoral College, was to obtain, in return, an Italian Pope, and, if possible, one of a conciliatory temper.¹ This anxiety was shared by all the Continental governments. Before the death of Pius IX., and on December 8, 1877, the Italian minister at the Court of Madrid writes to his government in Rome: "In my last conversation with Señor Silvela (the Spanish Minister of State), after dwelling for some time on the health of Pius IX., the discourse naturally turned to the next conclave, and on the attitude to be taken up on this occasion by the great powers. With regard to this subject the Minister of State expressed himself in these terms: "Spain wishes, and it entertains no doubt of it, that the conclave should be held in Rome with the greatest security and freedom; and it hopes that the choice of a successor to Pius IX. will fall upon a person disposed towards conciliation, and of temperate sentiments. Instructions in this sense were sent to the two representatives of Spain in Rome."²

In answer to this expressed hope of the Spanish court the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Melegari, writes on December 18th: "You can convince Señor Silvela that the Italian government believes itself able to secure to the conclave full liberty, not only against any of the manifestations or disorders which have taken place more than once on such occasions, but against every species of influence or pressure from the outside The government is perfectly conscious of the obligation incumbent on it of securing to the Sacred College all liberty to meet and deliberate; but it is also conscious of the very great facility which the condi-

¹ *Il Conclave di Leone XIII.*, by R. di Cesare, 3d ed., pp. 299, and following.

² *Ibidem.*

tion of the public mind in Italy, and especially in Rome, will afford (the conclave) toward accomplishing its purpose."¹

Marshal MacMahon, who was then President of the French Republic, seeing that the Radicals—that is, the anti-Christian Masonic sects—were daily acquiring more power in the cabinets of the Quirinal and the Tuilleries, was very much concerned about the next conclave. "M. Waddington assured me," writes General Cialdini, "that both he and his colleagues are quite anxious to calm the scruples of the marshal's conscience by obtaining for him the certainty that the king's government will respect, and make others respect, the liberty of the coming conclave, and that they will watch jealously over its perfect safety. The minister said repeatedly, and with great insistence, that he would be exceedingly grateful to me if I could obtain from the king's government a new and explicit declaration in this sense. He also expressed the wish to know whether the government of His Majesty had any reasons going to show or to found the presumption that any Jesuitical or ultra-montane influences are at work directing things so that the conclave would have to be held outside of Rome, and if in this case the government knew in what place these influences would induce the conclave to assemble." The desired pledge regarding the will and ability of the Italian government to secure the conclave's full liberty in Rome having been at once given the French cabinet, the latter forthwith replied: "France desires that the conclave shall meet in Rome, and that the election of a new Pope shall be effected in the freest manner, in the forms most regular and most in conformity with the traditional usages, in order that under no circumstances whatever the validity of the new election may be questioned. The French government, moreover, desires that the new Pope should be a man of moderate sentiments, who will make a reconciliation with Italy possible, and he must be an Italian. Our influence, within the limits of what is possible, shall be exercised in this direction. I could not," the French minister goes on to say, "pronounce here the name of any one individual, but it seems to me that after a long pontificate, like that of Pius IX., the conclave will be naturally disposed to elevate to the papal chair a man of advanced years. I do not yet know within what limits we might practically make use of our right of exclusion, nor do I conceal from myself the difficulty of upholding such a right. But I believe that in certain cases we should not hesitate to claim it—in the case, for instance, where we should perceive there was danger of raising to the pontificate one who was not an Italian. I have already had occasion to speak of the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 300.

future conclave to the representatives of the other Catholic powers, particularly with those of Spain and Austria, and I ascertained to my satisfaction that they agree with us in our wishes regarding the place to hold the next conclave, as well as with regard to the nationality of the future Pope.”¹

After the death of Pius IX. the Italian government addressed to its representatives abroad assurances that the promises made regarding the security of the Sacred College and the freedom of the conclave were being loyally fulfilled.

The cabinets of Berlin and St. Petersburg, then violently persecuting the Catholics of Germany and Russia, were also questioned by the Italian ambassadors about the conclave and the person of the future Pope. The sovereigns in both empires, as well as their ministers, expressed the desire to have a Pope of moderate temper and a conciliatory disposition, who would not hinder them in their endeavors to perfect the enslavement of the church throughout their dominions. The will of the autocrat in Russia, the tyrannical decrees of the imperial parliament and the Prussian legislature in Germany, “were the laws of the realm,” the persecutors said. Russia and Prussia did not wish to persecute their Catholic subjects; they only “demanded obedience to the laws of the land!” So they put the case.

So does the Italian government speak in 1891 of the series of oppressive, persecuting, unnecessary and most impolitic legislative enactments which have swept away, since the election of Leo XIII., almost every remnant of ecclesiastical property, every vestige of ecclesiastical immunity and freedom.

They are the laws of the kingdom, and must be rigorously executed. They must be observed by all, as if they were made to secure the most sacred rights of the Church, instead of openly aiming to extinguish within her bosom all the sources of Christian spirit and Catholic life.

But whether the statesmen and politicians represented by the Marquis di Rudini are disposed or permitted to carry out a policy of conciliation, justice or restitution toward the Holy See, or whether Crispi returns to power and the Italian radicals again have it all their own way in the parliament and in the government, certain it is that it becomes more than ever a necessity of the Italian situation to secure the election of an Italian Pope in the next conclave. There is no earthly reason why France, the only one of the powers possibly disposed to thwart Italy in this respect, should desire that the next Pope should be other than an Italian.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 302, 303; from the letter of December 25, 1877, addressed to the Italian minister by Signor Ressmann, Italian Chargé d’Affairs in Paris.

Unless France were able and willing to elect by her own influence a French Pope, to restore in his favor the civil principality of the papacy, and to uphold it by a permanent armed force, there is no likelihood that a Frenchman in our day and generation shall ascend the papal throne.

The present political outlook in Europe is such that, even in the event of a general war the issue would not so depress the power of Italy or exalt that of her neighbor across the Alps, as to leave the latter mistress of the peninsula and the Mediterranean or the armed protectress of the restored principality of the Popes.

III.

Italy, then, is quite safe in counting on an unbroken line of Italian pontiffs for this generation.

We have now come to the last of the three questions we purposed to answer: "Will the next Pope continue to reside in Rome?" What we have to say will serve, more even than what we have yet said, to convince the unprejudiced mind that the Popes should be natives of Italy, and that they should reside in Rome.

People who may take exception to this can never have been in Rome or studied attentively the constitution of the Catholic Church and the working in the centre of catholicity of that stupendous mechanism, the administration of a spiritual society having two hundred and twenty millions of subjects belonging to every race, nation and tribe under the sun, spread over every part of the habitable globe, and living under every known form of polity and government.

The Roman Catholic Church—that is, this spiritual empire of two hundred and twenty millions of human beings—claims to be the only true Church of Christ, of which the Pope is sole visible head on earth, Christ's vicar, shepherd, under Him, of both pastors and peoples—their teacher and guide in all things pertaining to salvation.

The Vicar of Christ is, by a special decree of Providence, Bishop of Rome as well as Bishop of bishops. Rome has been the residence of the Popes, the home of the papacy, the moral centre of Christendom, the capital of that vast spiritual empire, the Church, ever since the year 42 after Christ, when St. Peter came thither to govern, from that centre of empire, the entire flock committed to him by the Divine Shepherd, and there to die a bloody death in their defence and in testimony to the faith that was in him. There the successors of Peter have since continued to live, to teach, to govern, to suffer a long life of martyrdom down to Leo XIII., the two hundred and sixty-third in that glorious line of Pontiffs reach-

ing back to the fisherman of Galilee, whose body reposes in death in the catacombs of Nero, beneath the dome of the Vatican.

In Rome has Peter, ever-living in the person of each successive Pontiff, governed, taught, enlightened the Christian world, imprisoned often, martyred, exiled, persecuted, and ever triumphing in these stricken shepherds over persecutions, schisms, and heresies, over the hostile might of emperors and the fierce passions of the popular multitude, over the destruction wrought by successive hordes of barbarians, and the anti-Christian policy of a later civilization.

Condemned for two hundred years to worship, for the most part, in the Roman catacombs with their persecuted flock, the bishops of Rome only emerged into liberty and the light of day to see the magnificent Rome of the Cæsars fall a prey to Goth and Vandal. From out the ruins accumulated on the seven-hilled city and her immediate territory, the Pontiffs built up Christian Rome, gathered within the shelter of these ruins what the sword had spared of the Roman people, fostered them, protected them against Lombard and Greek, till gratitude for such loving guardianship, extended to generation after generation, induced the Roman people to look up to the Roman Pontiff as their temporal prince as well as their bishop. And then the new Christendom, which the Popes had created by their unwearied apostleship, ratified this pact of filial love and national gratitude, and the Popes became kings of Rome —their Royalty the head and crown of the entire social system in the Europe of our forefathers.

Papal, Christian Rome, was thus the home of the Common Father. There was the tomb of Peter; and by the side of Peter in the Vatican they had, in due time, laid the remains of his brother Apostle, Paul. These two had toiled together for a quarter of a century to lay deep and wide the foundations of that Church of Rome, "the Mother and Teacher of Churches"; they consecrated it with their blood on the same day, when the sword of Nero beheaded Paul on the road to Ostia, and his ferocious hatred condemned Peter to be crucified within view of the imperial palace on the Vatican.

The shrine of these brother Apostles in St. Peter's, and by the side of the Vatican palace, the prison-home of Leo XIII., is, in the nineteenth century, what it has been for so many ages, the very centre of Catholicity. Thither our forefathers were wont to resort as pilgrims; thither we, Catholics of every nationality and clime, still love to resort for our soul's comfort. Thither kings and queens from England, Ireland, Scotland, from the fair land of France, from martial Germany, from the East as well as from the West, came to the feet of the Common Father, to lay down their souls'

burthen, and to return, their hearts aflame with new ardor in Christ's cause, and for the benefit of their peoples.

Rome was the abode of him whom all nations called Parent. What wonder that princes, as well as their subjects, loved to find there, in life or in death, in good- or ill-fortune, a sure home and a resting-place. Discrowned royalty, in our own day, as in the past, though banned from every other realm, was sure of an asylum in Rome, although the refugees, in the days of their omnipotence, had been the worst enemies of the Church and the Pope. On the very spot where Peter was crucified, in the Church of Monte-Citorio, are the tombs of our exiled Princes, O'Neill and O'Donnell, while on entering St. Peter's the first tomb you meet is that of the last of the exiled Stuarts.

The Popes asked not of the unfortuates, who sought a refuge within the city of the Holy Apostles, what crimes or what virtues had drawn on them their ill fate. It sufficed that they were fallen, and needed what the political world never gives—forgiveness, forgetfulness, and peace.

Who dares to say, in the face of all past history, that they only came to Rome to plot and conspire, and to turn the hospitality of the Popes into an opportunity to prepare new revolutions?

But, that the Rome of the Popes was the loved resort of all Christians, and the secure retreat of the fallen and the unfortunate, is but the least of its merits.

It was the great central nursery of the apostolic spirit, the ever-flowing well-spring of sanctity and highest learning for the entire Church. It was the seat of that mighty system of church-government which extended its solicitude to every point of the globe, and brought every soul needing spiritual relief within reach of the hand, the ear, and the heart of Christ's vicar.

The Bishop of Rome has not only to care for the wants of his own flock within the Eternal City, and to see that the bishops of Italy fulfil faithfully the duties of their own charge; he has to render an account to the Eternal Prince of Pastors for every diocese in the Church Universal. More than that, the Bishop of Rome, because he is Christ's Vicar, and the Shepherd of shepherds here below, is bound by his office to exert himself to the utmost to bring within Christ's fold every tribe of earth, every child of the human race, since Christ died for all, and all are called to the possession of His everlasting inheritance.

If you could have had the good fortune to visit Rome, or to live a short time in it, before it fell into the power of its present rulers, you must have seen, after a first brief survey, that it resembled no other city in any civilized land. You might, even then, have heard some Protestant traveller ask, what use the Pope could possibly have for

so many palaces, so many immense institutions of beneficence and education? Where was the need, where the use of these hundreds of churches, of these splendid basilicas, inside and outside the walls of Rome, which remained empty and solitary, save on some rare feast days, throughout the year? What useful purpose could be served by these countless monasteries and convents, and all this bewildering variety of monks and nuns one passed continually in the streets? Then, there were these flocks of students, vested in black and white, in scarlet and purple, and the colleges belonging to various nationalities. Could not these young men be educated to better advantage at home in their respective countries, than beneath the fervid sun and in the malarious climate of Rome? So people queried; and not a few Catholics shared their wonder and their ignorance of the necessity and the marvelous propriety of things.

Have you reflected that the various departments of this vast ecclesiastical administration require offices of such extent as almost to form, with their buildings and their occupants, a city in themselves? Only think of what is comprised in the sole department concerned with the duties of the active Apostolate of the Holy See, the Propaganda, with its colleges, its library, its records, its printing presses issuing works in all civilized, and in so many uncivilized, languages, for the use of its missionaries and their converts,—think of what this great institution implies of gigantic labor, of world-wide enterprise. And yet, while its buildings are far too narrow for their purpose, while the revenues devoted by the economies and generosity of successive Popes and cardinals have been seized upon and cut down one-half by the present rulers of Christian Rome,—the needs of the Propaganda are daily increasing twofold and threefold, thanks to the fresh impulse given by Leo XIII. especially, and his two immediate predecessors to the divine work of spreading the Gospel among the heathen of both hemispheres. Already the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda has had to divide its work between the two standing committees of cardinals, with their prelate-consultors and inferior officers,—all carefully selected for distinguished scholarship and experience. One of these, of recent creation, is devoted to the Oriental Churches, their missions, ritual, literature, and all the priceless interests attached to their present condition and their promising future. The other committee of Propaganda continues to extend its care to the Catholic Churches of the Old World and the New, of Australia and Oceanica, where missionary zeal is striving to build up the edifice of religion in the divine form and the solid conditions intended by the Master.

The Propaganda is still a new wonder and a theme of enthusiastic praise to non-Catholic scholars visiting Rome. It is, how-

ever, only one among the many no less marvellous and necessary creations of the Bishops of Rome.

Next to the congregation *de Propaganda Fide* on which the Supreme Pastor devolves the principal share of his solicitude and authority,—there are the great monastic orders, the authorized religious societies of both sexes, which have their mother houses in Rome. These bodies are the efficient and God-sent auxiliary forces which have grown up spontaneously in Rome and all over the Christian world, under the creative breath of the spirit of God, the spirit of Holiness, to aid the secular missionary clergy in their apostleship in pagan and heretical countries, and most powerfully help also in the home field of the Church toward reviving and maintaining the realized ideal of the supernatural life taught in the Gospel. We here in America have only to recall who were the men whom the Popes first, and the Congregation of Propaganda, later, sent to evangelize the native tribes of our great Continent. Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, Augustinians, were the advance guard of that army of Apostles from the light of whose lives the indigenous American races learned to know Christ and His Gospel, to love Him, and to follow Him.

Around the chair of Peter, around the tomb where the hearts of the martyred Peter and Paul, still live and throb in their ashes, have sprung up under the breath of the Spirit, as naturally as the grass grows and the flowers bud forth in spring-tide, these monastic orders, these great religious families of men and women whose profession and whose lives shadow forth everlastinglly the divine, the supernatural virtues mirrored in the lives of Christ and His Blessed Mother.

It was but natural that the bishop of Rome, the shepherd of the whole flock, the undying Apostle bound to care for the salvation of the entire race of man in every point of space and time, should have in his home, in the seat of his supreme solicitude and apostolate, these monasteries and convents, the nurseries of that heavenly spirit, which is the very soul of Christianity, that from their garden he might transplant the choicest shoots to every clime. These houses where self-denial, and self-sacrifice forever live, where the love of Christ and the love of His redeemed is as deep as the ocean and as high as the heavens,—are the springs of living waters which flow from the City of God all over the earth, and are now making the desert places of Africa, Asia, America, and Australia bloom like the Garden of God and give forth the sweet odor of Christ.

Such are the monasteries, the convents, the religious houses of Rome.

But the Vicar of Christ must have in the city of the Holy Apos-

tles nurseries of science for the whole Church, even as he is bound to have nurseries of sanctity.

Even before the love and veneration of Christendom had placed on the brow of the successor St. Peter the crown of his threefold royalty,—the Popes had in their palace at the Lateran a school where the best masters taught all the sciences then known. When the civil principality of the Popes had become the centre of the social order of Christendom, what empire, what kingdom did, in proportion to its means, as much for science as did Rome and the States of the Church? With revenues far inferior to those of the city of New York, what did not the enlightened patronage of the Popes achieve for learning and for Christian art?

We mention art here, because Christian art was born in the sanctuary, and its glory must fade and depart from the land with the divine religion from whose radiance it sprang. We need only make this passing allusion here to one of the glories of the Papacy and pass on.

One reflection must, however, not be overlooked. We may be tempted to repeat the question so often asked by the superficial traveler or reader,—“why should Catholic nations have special colleges in Rome for the education of the elite of their priesthood?” We might as well ask,—“why do the foremost nations in Europe send their most promising students in architecture, painting, and sculpture to perfect themselves in Rome?” To the latter query we reply,—“because nowhere else in the world can one find perpetuated the best traditions of art, or find for study and imitation such incomparable masterpieces. And this, too, is due to the enlightened liberality of the bishops of Rome.”

In answer to the former query we say: In Rome alone are found the living traditions of the purest, the highest, and the most indispensable ecclesiastical science. There the best masters in theology, in Biblical knowledge and the languages and sciences which shed a light upon the Scriptures, have been ever generously supported by the Popes. In Rome, ever since the decadence of the law schools of Bologna and Paris, has canon law, the living law of the Church in her practice and administration, been taught with that regard to the theory and to practice, to be found only where the law courts of the universal church daily issue their decrees and their opinions. From Rome the young men thus educated at the fountain head return to their respective dioceses to teach in their turn the pure unadulterated doctrine as learned at the feet of the *Mater and Magistra Ecclesiarum Orbis*.

Thus do the Bishops of Rome provide in their episcopal city not only for the needs of the apostleship among the heathen and the faithful alike, but for the perpetuation and growth of sanctity and science and all the natural and supernatural plants which

bloom in God's garden beneath the shade of these two twin Trees of Life.

There are other papal institutions, other departments of this administration of the Catholic Church as a body spread over the whole earth, which we must now mention in order. We have said nothing of the Roman Chancery, of the Dataria, of the various congregations of cardinals to which are referred the cases of private appeal and public interest daily and hourly arriving from every country. Those appeals involve the most sacred interests and the most secret concerns of the conscience, and the poorest, the lowliest, the most distant member of Christ's wide flock has an inviolable right to come to Christ's vicar for light, for counsel, for healing; and no appeal is dismissed without hearing. It is still the word of St. Paul which guides the Supreme Pastor in his dealings with individuals: *Quis infirmatur et ego non infirmor?*" "What soul is sick that I am not sick with it?" There are matrimonial causes involving the honor and the peace of families. There are disputes between pastors and their flocks, between priests and their bishops, between bishops themselves on questions of right and jurisdiction—questions involving the interests of a whole ecclesiastical province, questions between the civil governments and the Church, questions regarding the religious orders among themselves or in relation to the secular clergy, questions on the solution of which depend the peace of a kingdom or an empire.

All these have to be put on record, as well as the judgments pronounced upon them. Imagine the immensity of these records after so many centuries, imagine the still greater magnitude of the public and private interests attached to their faithful preservation, and then think seriously of the incomparable anxiety with which the entire Catholic world contemplates, as at the present moment, the possibility of these records falling into the hands of the enemies of the Church! In this enumeration I have omitted the department of the Secretary of State, with its vast correspondence and its historical treasures.

But let us not be at present distracted by the thought of such a catastrophe from our true object, the study of *what it is to be bishop of Rome*, and why it is impossible to contemplate, under the ordinary providence of God, the city of Rome as not belonging to the Pope, and all these institutions, these records, these written annals of eighteen hundred years of the outward and inward life of the greatest society the world has known, as being ruthlessly annihilated or swept away from the possession and custody of Christ's Vicar?

Do my readers, whether Protestant or Catholic, after following my argument thus far, now perceive *why it is that the Bishop of Rome should reside in Rome?* how many sacred and imprescriptible titles

he has to the city of Rome? why it is that he should have in Rome neither master nor rival in the sovereignty consecrated by a possession of more than a thousand years, and by services to Rome and to Italy as incomparable as they are indisputable?

If what we have said be true and convincing, then it must be evident that the Bishop of Rome, except in rare and most extraordinary cases, should be a native of Italy, educated in Rome and long familiarized with the working of that great and unique administrative mechanism necessary to the regular government of the Universal Church.

The same reasons which compel all unbiased intellects to admit that the Bishop of Rome should be an Italian must also force upon them the conclusion that the Pope should reside in Rome.

The whole of Christendom—indeed, the whole civilized world—is deeply, vitally interested in maintaining the Pontiffs in possession of their episcopal city, in the undisturbed and uninterrupted government of the Church from this, its natural, its providentially appointed centre.

The safety, the preservation of the records of the Holy See in all the complexity we have rapidly described is a matter of household, of personal concern to the Catholics of every nation, nay, to non-Catholics themselves, who know what historical treasures would be imperiled or destroyed, especially in the present temper of the Italian revolutionists, by the forced exile of the Pope and the College of Cardinals. We say nothing of the art treasures gathered during so many centuries by the diligent liberality of the Roman court.

Four times within the century have the Vatican, the Quirinal, with the other apostolic palaces and the offices of the ecclesiastical administration fallen into the hands of the enemies of the Church. Each time the records were pillaged of whatever struck the fancy, attracted the cupidity or wounded the sectarian and national sentiments of the despoilers. Much was destroyed which no money could purchase and no industry restore, much more was scattered by the brigands throughout the capitals of Europe. The damage thus done is irreparable.

But the loss to science and to art which would be certain in the fierce excitement now prevailing in Italy, to follow the flight of the Holy Father and his court could not be compared to the immense moral mischief consequent upon the disturbance caused in the government of the Church.

Meanwhile it behooves Leo. XIII. to show what the successor of the apostles can do to defend the rights and interests of which he is the sworn guardian. A disarmed Pope, forsaken by the powers and peoples of Christendom, and having to face in Rome a revolutionary and usurping government and the Masonic power,

which urges it to resort to the most violent extremities, can only say to those who ask him to give up the sacred trust confided to him, *non possumus*, "we cannot."¹ Popes have died ere now in defence of their flock and rather than betray the divine interests of souls.

A Pope may gloriously die in asserting his right to Rome, both as his own particular Episcopal See, as the natural and traditional seat of government of the Universal Church, as the seat, too, of that temporal sovereignty created for him by Catholic Christendom. That sovereignty is the guaranty and bulwark of the Pontiff's independence and freedom in the discharge of his office as Supreme Pastor.

It may well be that the day has come when the Bishops of Rome must shed their blood in order to vindicate their indefeasible right to this sovereignty. If, in the ordinary course of Providence, and when the care of the Roman Pontiffs embrace 220,000,000 souls all over the globe, it be more than ever absolutely necessary that they should be free, in the discharge of their office, from the dictation and control of any earthly power and master, then a temporal sovereignty is a necessary means to such an end. And where but in Rome should be the seat of this sovereignty?

Has the fulness of time come to assert this truth and vindicate the right to such liberty, by laying down one's life? Perhaps Christ now demands of His Vicar to say to the nations that he is ready to die rather than give up the city of Rome to any human power or to the declared enemies of the Church and her Founder. Perhaps the further consecration of a martyr's blood, shed to protect the Chair of Peter, is needed to open the eyes of Christendom, and to touch the heart of the Italian people, apparently forgetful of what they owe to the long line of the Bishops of Rome.

It is a moving spectacle, at the close of this nineteenth century of the life of the Christian Church, to see Leo XIII., the 263d Bishop of Rome, braving the anticlerical clubs, the threats of assassination, and the cowardly connivance of the Quirinal, rather than yield to the pretensions of the latter or the threats of the former.

Leo XIII. is a singular and happy compound of moderation, invincible firmness and child-like conscientiousness. We know he will not quail or yield, or give up Rome and his flock to the wolves. The Cardinals are also sworn to defend to the death the sacred interests of the Roman Church. The scarlet robes they wear are to remind them that they should be ready to shed their blood in so holy a cause. The eyes of the whole world are now on them.

Rome is the city of martyrs. On every one of the Seven

¹ Acts iv. 20: "WE CANNOT but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

Hills are monuments reared to commemorate the death of Christ's glorious witnesses. In the Mamertine Prison they show you the pillar to which Peter was chained before being led out to crucifixion. All around the adjoining Forum are the ruins of the Basilicas or Imperial Courts, in which Popes, priests, senators and noble ladies, men and women of every degree, were called to answer for the faith that was in them, tortured to compel them to abjure the name of Christ, and finally handed over to the executioner. In the ruined Coliseum towering near the Forum, Christians, men, women and children, were exposed to the wild beasts to vary the sports of a Roman populace. The floor of this vast amphitheatre was all soaked in the blood of martyrs. Christian ages were wont to consider it as a holy place. There Christian Rome had ever been wont to assemble to perform the devotions of Christ's Passion, adoring the Divine King of Martyrs where so many had borne him heroic witness by the shedding of their blood. What though the present rulers of Rome have desecrated this glorious shrine of Christian heroism, torn down the cross from its walls and the emblems of Christ's suffering from the area beneath? Vandalism cannot blot out the consecration which clings to the stones above and around, and to the very earth beneath. We pilgrims from the New World kneel still on that bare earth and kiss the foot-prints left there by that glorious disciple of St. John the Apostle, Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch and martyr.

All Rome, within her walls and outside in her Catacombs, is hallowed soil; our hearts, our souls cling to its very ruins. Surely neither Pope nor cardinals will give up this treasure-house of all that is most holy and most dear to us, to the sacrilegious hands ready to desecrate, to despoil, to destroy.

Whatever the press of Europe and America may publish to the contrary, we refuse to credit what is last reported of the Italian government. They cannot have adopted the suicidal policy of urging, counselling or countenancing the departure from Rome of the Pope and the cardinals. We cannot conceive that Austria, Hungary, Germany, France, or even Great Britain, would fail to remonstrate with such a mad resolve of the Italian Cabinet, or hesitate to use their influence both with the Holy Father and King Umberto, to dissuade them from a course of action so fatal to both.

As for us, we know Leo XIII. too well to believe for one moment that he has ever seriously entertained the resolution of abandoning Rome. He is one who can die like a soldier at his post. He is not a coward to run away, and mask faint-heartedness under the name of prudence.

With him in the hour of his distress and dire need are our hearts, our prayers, our veneration and our undying devotion.

BERNARD O'REILLY, D.D.

CONSCIOUS ACTS.

MUCH has been written, in recent years, on the subject of consciousness. Conflicting theories are proposed for explaining this action of man's intellect, some of them more or less materialistic, some based on peculiar principles of false mental philosophy, and not a few of such speculations helping to render its nature quite obscure to many minds. Without here stating or discussing the various opinions that have been defended, the attempt will be made in this article to define and describe the intellectual action styled consciousness, just as it is made known to us on the testimony of that consciousness itself. This may be of some use, since no one who fails rightly to understand this intellectual operation, can attain to any full and precise knowledge of psychology. There is some repetition in what follows, because of the same matter being proposed under different aspects, in order to render the subject of consciousness, which of its nature is difficult, more clear and intelligible to the general reader.

Consciousness is that knowledge which the intellect has of itself; and which consists in the intellect knowing itself, knowing its own acts as its own, and knowing that it knows. The intellect as capable of thus knowing itself and its acts as its own, is often styled, in popular language, the power or faculty of consciousness; yet, consciousness is not a faculty distinct from the intellect itself.

The intellect is distinguished as directly conscious, and reflexly conscious; and it is necessary to understand the two operations clearly in order to comprehend the nature of consciousness, as well as the intellect's natural manner of knowing any of its objects.

The intellect as directly conscious, has knowledge of itself jointly with its knowledge of an object, of what affects itself or is in itself. Hence the name given to this accompanying self-knowledge in the intellect, *consciousness*,¹ derived from *conscire*, which signifies to know along with, together with, jointly with. The human intellect cannot know itself directly, except along with something else which is perceived by means of an actual idea; but the intellect thus directly conscious of itself does not then form any separate idea of itself.

¹ "Conscientia," is defined in the dictionaries, "joint knowledge;" see Andrews, the *Century Dictionary*, Oxford translation of Aristotle. St. Thomas, p. 1 qu. 79, a. 13, in C, says, "conscientia dicitur cum alio scientia;" and in another place, "conscire dicitur quasi simul scire," consciousness is essential to intellectual knowledge; it is an intrinsic constituent of such knowledge.

In knowing self as an object, reflexly or by introspection, the intellect forms its idea of self just as it forms its idea in knowing any other object.¹ Along with this act of knowing itself reflexly by means of an idea of self formed for that end, the intellect has, at the same time, its accompanying *direct* consciousness of self. Indeed, it is only by direct consciousness that it knows itself as present, and as acting or knowing, and reflex knowledge of self as an object, is not possible, unless accompanied with direct consciousness.

The mind knows itself directly, then; not, however, by distinguishing² or thinking in particular about itself, but as present to itself, and it cannot know any object whatever, except jointly with knowing self through direct consciousness. By this direct consciousness the intellect has knowledge of itself which is absolutely intuitive. Without this intuition of self as present, we could not have the evidence that our reflex knowledge of self is objectively real, or is anything more than ideal. The ideas which the intellect forms of itself as an object, are derived from images pictured in the fancy; for, as psychology teaches, all our ideas of any objects whatever, are formed dependently on the ministry of some or other representations in the fancy. Thus it happens that the intellect knows itself reflexly by means of ideas, just as it knows any object different from itself. The intellect's reflex knowledge of itself as an object is intuitive, though such intuition is not so immediate as is direct consciousness. Reflex knowledge is not necessarily opposed to intuition; it is opposed to direct knowledge.

What is the first *object* known by man's intellect? Does it first know itself, its own act, or first know another object distinct from self?

The first object actually known by man's intellect, or known by means of an idea expressing that object, is not the intellect's own act of knowing, as "I think, *cogito*." It is true that the intellect must have direct though confused consciousness even of its first act of knowing an object by means of an idea; and thus it is able to rethink such idea reflexly. The intellect cannot rethink and recognize an idea not previously *cognized as its own*, at least in a confused manner. Man's intellect knows itself or its act, "I think, *cogito*," as an object, only by a reflex and secondary act; nor can the intellect by means of a mental word or idea expressly know itself to exist, except by the reflex operation of seeing itself act or

¹ St. Thomas says, p. I, qu. 14, a. 2, ad. 3, "intellectus sic intelligit seipsum per speciem intelligibilem sicut et alia;" with Aristotle in 3 de Anima, *kai ἀὐτὸς δὲ νοητός ωντερ τὰ νοητά*: The intellect knows itself by means of an idea just as it knows other objects.

² "Anima semper intelligit se non discernendo vel cogitando aliquid de se sed in quantum praesens est sibi," St. Thomas in 2 sent disp. 39, qu. I, a. I.

think, and then inferring its existence therefrom. Hence, the question as with Descartes, may be thus stated: is man's first cognition "cogito, I think?" Does man know only by inference, or only as a logical conclusion, "*ergo, existo*, therefore I exist?"

While it is true that the intellect's own act is not the first thing which the intellect knows, or of which it forms its first idea, sensible things being the first objects thus known; yet, the intellect has, at least confusedly, direct consciousness of its act and its own existence when it does first know its connatural object. As before said, the intellect first directly knows its act of knowing another object jointly with knowing that object; it is only then it can first reflexly know that act or itself, by forming for itself an idea of that act or of itself.

Descartes makes the *primum cognitum* for man's intellect, or the first object known to it, *cogito*, I think. But this act cannot be known as an object, till after the act of thinking something else; the first object known is the thing which is thought, not the mere act by which it is thought. The primary object of man's intellect is the sensible thing;¹ yet, his intellect, in itself, would be capable of knowing any being whatever, provided it were duly presented to it. "I think" is not the first thing known; for direct knowledge is prior to reflex knowledge, and to know as an object that "I think," is reflex cognition.

Descartes assumed that the "primum cognitum" is also the "primum philosophicum," and that "cogito," I think, is the primum cognitum. Both these hypotheses are untrue in fact; "cogito," I think, is not the first object known to the human mind. Besides, philosophy, or philosophical reasoning, must start from general principles of metaphysics or axioms, because they are the absolute criteria of philosophical truth. In describing the origin of ideas and of man's knowledge, it will be pertinent to that special aim to ascertain what is naturally first known to the human mind. When man's knowledge is thus considered in the order of its first origin, it must be said that objects are known prior to acts, and acts are known prior to the power of eliciting those acts.²

Reflection is mental work which the intellect is carrying on daily; it is an exercise of attention by which the mind either contemplates its own acts as its own acts, or considers the objects ex-

¹ "Intellectus humani, qui est conjunctus corpori, proprium objectum est quidditas, sive natura in materia corporali existens, et per hujusmodi naturas rerum visibilium, etiam in invisibilium rerum aliquam cognitionem ascendit." (Div. Thom., I p., qu. 84, art. 7 in C.). The object of the human intellect which is conjoined to the body, is the essence or nature existing in corporeal matter; and by means of such *natures* of visible things, it also ascends to some knowledge of invisible things.

² St. Thomas, p. 1, qu. 87, a. 3 in C., with Aristotle, "Objecta præcognoscuntur actibus, et actus potentiss."

pressed in its ideas. When one returns to the idea in his mind, and contemplates it as an idea in his own mind, or as a modification of himself as its subject, then his reflection is styled by some authors psychological. But when one returns to the idea in his mind, in order to consider the object represented by that idea, not thinking of the idea itself as an idea, or of himself as having that idea, then the reflection is ontological. For example, we may think of a *triangle*, in order to consider the nature and properties of that figure, but without thinking at all of the idea that is representing the triangle in the mind; this reflection would be ontological. Or we may think of our idea which represents the triangle, in order to consider the idea, or how our mind acts when it thinks this idea; our reflection is then psychological. In both kinds of reflection the mind, in some manner, rethinks its ideas, since it recalls or returns to those ideas in order to consider them again.

The intellect, by its direct consciousness, is proximately disposed, and ready actually to reflect on itself and see its own acts objectively as its own; hence direct consciousness is often styled habitual consciousness. In this direct consciousness the intellect has undistinguished and confused knowledge of itself and its act conjointly with knowing objects by means of those acts, and such knowledge of itself in direct consciousness is immediate knowledge. The medium or principle by which it knows itself directly is not an idea of itself, nor does it see its own essence; but it knows its own presence intimately, immediately, directly. The intellect is thus directly and immediately knowable to self by means of its act, because besides being present to self, it is an immaterial or spiritual faculty. This direct consciousness is by some aptly styled "inner consciousness," it being the soul's inmost self-knowledge; by others this power of knowing self is less happily called "sensus intimus," or the inmost sense. In thus knowing itself, the intellect's presence to itself—or, more strictly, the intellect as present to itself—concurs, as before observed, by way of a principle, somewhat as the idea concurs, by way of a principle, with the intellect in knowing objects extrinsic to itself.

When the intellect knows itself as an object, its action is then reflex or introspective. In this reflex operation the intellect forms an idea in which it expresses itself as an object, using representations in the fancy, as it does in forming ideas of other objects. Hence the idea of itself thus formed presupposes direct consciousness, back on which the intellect returns by this operation of reflex consciousness.

Such reflex knowledge of self is peculiar only to intellectual or spiritual natures, for no organic faculty is capable of this self-introspection, or, as it is expressed, of returning on itself with a com-

plete return.¹ A nature that is capable of reflex action, by which it knows itself and its own acts as its own, or perceives them as in itself, must be *simply* and *totally* present to itself, and, consequently, it cannot consist of extended parts joined to parts. In other words, such a nature cannot consist of parts outside of parts or of parts occupying different divisions of space; but it must be one simple, indivisible unity, completely present to self or compenetrating self.

It may be easily conceived how an intelligent being thus simply and totally present to itself can perceive and know itself, because the act, the power of perceiving and the object perceived by it are present to each other, and they are duly proportioned to each other; the faculty, the object and the act are all compenetratively present to each other, which is impossible when the faculty is an organic one, as will be shown further on. This direct and reflex operation of the soul, by which it knows itself, and its acts as its own, furnishes one of the most conclusive proofs of the soul's simplicity and spirituality, since none but an unextended, indivisible and completely simple nature could have such action.

Since the intellect's knowledge of its own existence by direct consciousness is so immediately intuitive, we should say that the intellect knows its own existence *in* its acts rather than *by means* of its acts; for the acts of the intellect, in direct consciousness, do not serve as a logical medium from which its existence is inferred. They serve rather as a medium *in quo*, as the mirror does when it expresses one's countenance visibly to him.

Direct consciousness of self seems to be the nearest approach which the human intellect makes, in our present state of existence, towards immediately apprehending the concrete *singular*. It is believed that the separate or disembodied soul perceives itself directly and perfectly as *singular*. The intellect perceives its own act immediately in direct consciousness then, because it is present and it is duly proportioned as an object to the intellect's natural power of knowing; it is, indeed, both medium and object known. God is also most intimately present to the soul and its faculties; He is present as conserving them in existence and action. But though God is thus present to the intellect, yet His essence is not an object proportioned to man's intellect, so as to be immediately apprehensible or visible, even in a confused manner, through the natural light of reason. The light or medium required for the human intellect to see God's essence intuitively is a supernatural principle, is the "lumen gloriæ."

¹ "Substantiae intellectuales redeunt ad essentiam suam reditio-ne completa." —P. 1, qu. 14, a. 2, ad. 1.

An organic faculty is incapable of either direct or reflex consciousness. As a fact, for example, the eye, which is admitted to be the most perfect of our external senses, sees, but it does not see that it sees; it gives no testimony of what happens in itself when seeing, it gives testimony only of the visible object *external* to itself. No wonder, then, that mankind did not know till Kepler proved the fact, at the beginning of the 17th century, that the eye sees by means of an image of the visible object projected by the lens of the eye on the retina. Hence the eye does not see itself seeing; the object perceived by a sense must be extrinsic to it. As St. Thomas says, "The external sense never perceives its own act, and, therefore, the act of that sense is perceived by the common sensory."¹ We have no evidence whatever that even the fancy, which is the brightest internal sense, knows its own act of imagining or picturing objects, which it always does by clothing those objects with corporeal properties. Even the brute must have a power answering to the common sensory; for no animal can direct its own actions in relation to the objects of its external senses, or practically co-ordinate and unify its movements in respect to those objects, unless it knows them as one complete sentient nature knows. Consequently, even the brute animal necessarily requires some *one* faculty which can distinguish all the external sensations; that is, even the irrational animal requires the power hereby attributed to the common sensory. Yet brutes have no intellect, because they cannot know what is wholly abstract, as is the universal; nor can they know the subject and predicate of a judgment separately, and then conjoin them with the copula. The action of the fancy, as well as that of the common sensory, is always direct; it is never reflex, nor can either one of those internal senses know itself or be cognizant of itself jointly with knowing an object, as the intellect is in its direct consciousness when it apprehends or thinks of any object.

According to a theory long taught in all the schools and not yet replaced by an equally satisfactory one, the common sensory² is an organ in the brain, in which as in a centre, the nerves from all the external senses meet, or rather, from which as a radix or centre, nerves extend to the external senses. While this internal sense perceives what reaches it from the external senses, and transmits it to the fancy, yet neither it nor the fancy can perceive itself or its own act, any more than the eye can. This is because organic powers cannot retroact, are not capable of self-introspec-

¹ "Sensus proprius non sentit actum suum, et ideo actus sensus propriae percipitur per sensum communem."—P. 1, qu. 87, a. 3, ad. 3.

² Many physiologists now give a more extended meaning to the phrase "common sensory," making it signify the entire nervous system as capable of sensation.

tion and thereby of contemplating their own internal actions. Not being simple agents, they are present to themselves only quantitatively, or as extended matter, having parts adjoined to each other by extraposition. A sense cannot perceive any object, unless that object be extrinsic to the sense. Hence, if we suppose a sense to perceive itself or its act as its own act, we must conceive that sense to be, at the same time, the external object perceived, and the power perceiving it; or it must be extrinsically presented as an object before itself, and thus be in two separate places at one and the same time, a supposition which is absurd. An organic power does not know the external object's representative likeness which is in itself; it perceives only the object producing such likeness in it: the eye does not see the image on the retina, it sees only the object producing that image. But it is easy to conceive the intellect's act of knowing its own act immediately and directly; for the object seen and the power seeing it are, in this case, simple and one, they have no quantity, no parts outside of parts, but are completely and absolutely present one to the other. This fact that the intellect does know its own act, furnishes the most conclusive proof, as said, of the soul's simplicity.

Here it may be asked, does the intellect, then, in its consciousness, apprehend only its own acts, or does it distinctly apprehend also itself as the subject of those acts? Does the intellect by means of its consciousness perceive the soul's essence or the nature of the soul? St. Augustine says,¹ pertinently to these questions, "the human soul is so made that it is never unmindful of self, never fails to know itself, never fails to love itself." St. Bonaventure teaches that man's intellect knows itself, "scientia notitiae, non scientia discretionis"; that is, the intellect knows itself with knowledge that notices or sees, not, however, with knowledge which discerns, or distinguishes. St. Thomas says that the intellect knows itself and knows also its act of knowing.²

In direct consciousness, the intellect implicitly knows or apprehends itself as the subject of its own acts, though it does not know itself explicitly as an object; it knows itself jointly with its idea of any object, but not, as before said, by a separate idea of itself, and this is to know itself implicitly as the subject of such idea. While the intellect can thus directly think itself, it can also rethink itself, "mens se cogitat, et se recognoscit;" and in rethinking self, it does so by forming an idea expressing itself explicitly. In thus rethinking self, by returning on itself, we again see how the intellect is the faculty knowing, the object known,

¹ "Sic condita est mens humana, ut nunquam sui non meminerit, nunquam se non intelligat, nunquam se non diligit."—De Trinit, lib. 14, c. 14, No. 18.

² "Intellectus cognoscit seipsum, et suum intelligere."—Contr. gent., lib. 2, c. 66.

and the subject of the 'knowledge, "sciens et scitum sunt una res." St. Thomas thus states the order in which the acts of consciousness succeed each other, "what is first known by the human intellect, is the essence of a material thing; and secondarily is known the act by which the object is known; and by means of the act the intellect itself is known, whose perfection it is to understand.¹

We may here consider the soul as knowing itself under two respects; and first, to borrow the terminology of the old schools, by way of answer to the question, "an sit;" that is, does knowledge of the soul's existence fall under consciousness? Secondly, as to the question "quid sit," does the essence or the nature of the soul fall under consciousness? The soul knows its own existence immediately and intuitively through its direct consciousness, by the simple and indivisible presence of the soul to itself; but it does not know its existence by way of an object, except reflexly, and as expressed by means of an universal idea, just as it knows any other object.

The intellect does not know immediately and intuitively its own nature nor its essential properties as a spiritual substance. The soul comes to the knowledge of its own nature and properties, only by reasoning to them from its acts manifested in direct consciousness. Hence, the soul's knowledge of its own nature as a spiritual substance, is abstract knowledge, not immediate or intuitive knowledge. If the intellect directly and immediately apprehended its own essence and that of the soul, then all minds would know evidently the nature of the soul and think alike both of it and its essential properties. While consciousness gives intuitive knowledge of the soul as existing, yet knowledge of the soul's *nature* is abstract; and on this account many minds are ignorant of the soul's nature, since ignorance or error more easily occurs in regard to truth which requires abstract and difficult demonstration. As St. Thomas says,² "For acquiring knowledge of the mind, its presence does not suffice, but diligent and subtle inquiry is required. Hence it comes that many are ignorant of the soul's nature, and also that many have erred concerning the soul's nature."

Since reflex consciousness of self is always accompanied with direct consciousness, for the mind does not think rationally of any object without direct consciousness in some degree, at least, it

¹ "Id quod primo cognoscitur ab intellectu humano est natura rei materialis; et secundario cognoscitur ipse actus quo cognoscitur objectum; et per actum cognoscitur ipse intellectus, cuius est perfectio ipsum intelligere."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 3.

² "Ad cognitionem de mente habendam non sufficit ejus praesentia sed requiritur diligens et subtilis inquisitio, unde et multi naturam animae ignorant, et multi etiam circa naturam animae erraverunt."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 1, in C.

follows that no mind can positively doubt of its own existence or of its own conscious acts.

Through self-consciousness, the intellect has a perception not only of its own act, but also of the will's acts. The explanation of this truth is made more evident and the fact is more easily comprehended, if it be borne in mind that the will is intrinsically and radically of the reason, and since the reason is conceived to be its subject, it is usually defined to be "the rational appetite."¹ As St. Thomas says, the act of the will is seen by the intellect, for it is in the intellect as in its first principle and in its proper subject; Aristotle uses similar language, "the will is in the reason." Experience attests the fact, however, that acts of the will are less evident to us than are acts of the intellect itself. The intellect has habitual knowledge also of the body, dependently on the senses; and it can readily have actual or reflex conscious knowledge of what sensibly affects the body.

Consciousness is essential to responsibility; but in insane mental action, in dreaming, and in total absent-mindedness the intellect does not know itself, or its acts, or the objective order of things, in their true and real relations; and hence the will, in these abnormal states of the intellect, is not capable of rational choice.

Dr. Reid says truly that "consciousness is always employed about the present."² But his language is less accurate when he asserts, with Locke, that "consciousness is an internal sense"; for it is, under different respects, an act of the intellect, and the faculty itself of intellect. It is true that "consciousness is always employed about the present;" but it can give present testimony also of its own past operations.

When the soul is separated from the body, it has no fancy to mirror representations before it, and the intellect cannot naturally form an idea or mental word expressing any object without the concurrence of an image in the fancy. Will the intellect, when the soul is in such a condition, be unable to know itself or its acts reflexly?

It is reasonable to suppose that the soul when it is separated from the body should have all the action befitting its disembodied state of existence, and, therefore, being of a simple and spiritual nature, that it should have consciousness both direct and reflex, more perfectly than it now has. The soul's direct consciousness, it may be consistently inferred, should consist in the immediate and evident intuition of its own essence as present, with a fulness of

¹ "Inclinatio intelligibilis, quæ est actus voluntatis, est intelligibiliter in intelligente sicut in primo principio, et in proprio subiecto, unde philosophus dicit (*De Anima*, lib. 3, text 42) voluntas in ratione est."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 4, see also ad. 3, of the same article.

² Vol. ii., essay vi., ch. i.

self-perception. The intellect's act of reflexly viewing itself with its retained past acts, could not be by means of ideas abstracted from representations in the fancy; it would immediately perceive the soul's essence, that essence being immaterial, present to the intellect, and as an object proportioned to it.¹

There seems no reason to doubt that the human intellect, in that state of the soul's existence, could recall and reflexly know itself with its past acts. Since the intellect's ideas acquired while the soul is in union with the body are its own acts, it is legitimately inferred that they will be retained and recognized by the intellectual memory, when the soul is separated from the body. After the soul and body shall have been reunited in a perfect state of existence, the soul, it may reasonably be conjectured, will then have greater supremacy over the body than it now has; at least, as to its faculties and their virtues. The soul's specific method of knowing by reason, will then be perfected by the body, not impeded by it, as in our present state. The soul will then see intuitively and distinctly its own essence, the nature of the union between soul and body, and all intrinsic properties of the composite thereby formed.

Strictly speaking, the intellect cannot be said to have knowledge at all of any object, unless it know, at least, confusedly, its own act as its own, and itself as the subject of its own act, jointly with knowing the object. As observed by an acute thinker, "an act of the intellect, when it exists, certifies its own existence by means of itself;² that is, is certified by direct consciousness. A self-evident thing certifies itself objectively; the intellect consciously perceiving, certifies its act, and itself as perceiving by that act.

Reid regards the intellect's necessary assent to what is thus self-evident to it, as instinctive; Mill usually calls such assent, the mind's "belief"; Sir Wm. Hamilton asserts, with Luther whom he cites, that "the certainty of all our knowledge is ultimately resolvable into a certainty of belief."³ They all suppose that no

¹ The following citation will indicate the manner in which the scholastic authors reason on this subject: "Non opus est specie intelligibili quando objectum est per se praesens intellectui, et immateriale . . . species impressa solum ponitur ut supplet absentiam et efficacitatem objecti. . . . Duo sunt officia speciei, nempe, objectum repraesentare intellectui, et cum intellectu active concurrere ad elicendam visionem."—(Becanus, Tract. I, c. 9, qu. 2.) That is, "There is no need of an intelligible species (idea), when the object itself is immediately present to the intellect, and is immaterial. The impressed species is intended to supply the absence and the efficacy of the object. There are two offices of the species, namely, to represent the object to the intellect, and actively to concur with the intellect in eliciting vision," or perception.

² "Actus intellectus cum existit, per seipsam certificat de sua existentia."—Mauro, tom. i., qu. 12, ad 2.

³ Logic, sect. 17. It favors the views of skepticism thus to distort the term "belief"

degree of self-evidence fully accounts as cause and sufficient reason for the intellect's assent to any truth. To resolve all certainty of our knowledge, however, into a "certainty of belief," is to reduce all our certainty to a blind assent of the intellect to what it accepts on trust, as true; but this would not be genuine certainty at all. For evident truth produces certainty, not because believed in, but because it is seen as evident truth. Assent to truth clearly seen through its own evidence, is not belief. Belief is assent of the intellect to evident truth, on account of credible testimony. Belief is not even rational assent at all, if it never has presupposed to it perfect evidence of credibility as its ultimate motive. If all our certainty is belief, we cannot be strictly said to have knowledge at all.

As already observed, the nearest approach which the human intellect makes, in our present life on earth, to knowing the concrete singular object directly, is in the act of direct consciousness by which the intellect knows itself *praesentialiter*, or knows itself immediately, as present to itself. Yet this immediate knowledge which the intellect has of itself in direct consciousness is not perfect, because its perception of itself is not distinctly expressed in a mental word or idea. St. Thomas states and answers an objection¹ which will help to render the explanation of this subject more intelligible: "Our intellect perceives itself; but the intellect is a singular object, otherwise it could not have an act, since acts are of singular things; therefore, our intellect knows the singular." Answer, "The singular is not repugnant to intellectual power, as singular, but as being material; because nothing is understood, except in an immaterial manner. Therefore, if there be something both singular and immaterial, as the intellect is, that is not repugnant to intellectual power."

The objection is based on the assumption that the human intellect does not know any singular concrete object, except in a secondary manner and reflexly; namely, by applying to that object an idea or mental word previously formed for expressing what is conceived to be the object's essence, and in fact this is always the intellect's action in knowing a singular object which is material. For instance, when an object is presented through the senses, the intellect, at least, implicitly asks the question, "quid est; what is it?" After duly observing and reflecting, the intellect forms its idea or word which expresses the answering *quiddity*, or essence of the object as understood by it, and it can then by a second action apply its idea to that singular object proposed by the senses.

from its original and proper signification. Locke, bk. iv., ch. 15, § 3, attributes to the word "belief" its received meaning.

¹ P. I, qu. 86, a. 1, objection 3.

The intellect must needs know what the nature of an object is before it can *say*, so to speak, what that object is; or the intellect's first operation in knowing is to form its idea of the object proposed to it, and its next act is to apply that idea directly to the object, and this is its act of knowing that object.

The idea formed by the intellect to express the *quiddity* or essence of a proposed concrete and actual thing is, of its nature, a universal, since every ideal essence is universal or general. Yet, the intellect may not, at first forming such idea, reflexly attend to its character as universal; the idea as in this manner first formed is styled a direct universal, not a reflex one, because it is not seen explicitly as applicable to all its inferiors, in which case it would be the reflex universal. But although such idea be not reflexly generalized, nevertheless, it is, as before said, of its very nature, universal. St. Thomas thus expresses the thought, "Our intellect does not understand a thing, except by abstracting; and by the very abstraction from material conditions, that which is abstracted is made universal."¹

Attention to the action of one's own mind in knowing, when a new or unfamiliar object is presented, will enable him to see for himself that, as a fact, his intellect's action is just that which is above described; namely, before the intellect can know the singular concrete object presented through the senses, it must form its idea or mental word expressive of what the object's nature is, and then it can with another act know the particular object by means of this previously formed idea. Hence the human intellect is said to know the universal primarily and directly, and to know the singular secondarily and reflexly.

It may be repeated, then, by way of conclusion, that consciousness is self-knowledge, and this self-knowledge is most strictly and properly direct consciousness. Reflex consciousness is self-knowledge because founded on the direct, and because it includes the direct. Indeed it is only by means of direct consciousness that the intellect immediately perceives its own acts as its own, or knows itself as the subject of those acts; "non per essentiam suam, sed per actum suum cognoscit se intellectus," the intellect knows itself by means of its own acts, not by perceiving its own essence directly.² Direct consciousness is the intellect's immediate intuition of its own acts as its own acts; reflex consciousness of self, is rather an act of *reason*, by which an idea or mental word is formed and made to express distinctly the intellect's act as an object.

WALTER H. HILL, S. J.

¹ P. I, qu. 57, a. 2, ad. 1.

² P. I, qu. 87, a. 1, in C.

“IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS, IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS, IN
OMNIBUS CARITAS.”

BY *necessary* things we are to understand revealed truths, the truths of faith. Faith is necessary, since “without faith it is impossible to please God” (Heb. xi., 6), and without pleasing God here we cannot come to the possession of eternal happiness hereafter, the one thing necessary for all. Saving or divine faith implies *unity* in the source of the truths believed, and in the individuals believing. God must be the author or revealer of the truths He wishes us to believe, and all men must believe the same truths, and there can be no contradiction in the truths themselves.

All men may not explicitly believe the same number of truths, since some may, without any fault of theirs, be ignorant of some revealed truths. But even these must be in the disposition to believe all as soon and as far as they are known to them. Without this disposition a man cannot have true faith. For we cannot refuse belief in one revealed truth without forfeiting faith altogether. Those disciples made shipwreck of the faith who followed our Lord until His revealing to them that He would give them His flesh to eat, but then “went back and walked no more with him,” saying, “this saying is hard and who can hear it” (St. John, vi., 61)?

Nor is it for man to say this truth is important, that other is non-essential. All revealed truths are equally essential. Deny one, and you deny the veracity of God. Neither is it for man to choose what truths to believe, but it belongs to God to propose what truths He will have him to believe. Were it otherwise, man’s mind would determine revealed truth instead of being determined by it, would subject revealed truth to itself instead of being made subject to it; reason would be above faith, man above God. In choosing how much to believe, man would be independent of the Divine Mediator. For our Lord is mediator only through faith in His words. And as faith is a means to an end, he that puts himself above the means, is independent of them; and this he does who determines the means for himself, who chooses how much to believe.

So far as to what ought to be. As to matter of fact, all Catholics believe revealed truths, the unlearned as well as the learned. For in believing all the Church believes and teaches, they include the sum total of revealed truths. For the Church of Christ has by

Him been established custodian of all revealed truth, and guaranteed from error by His solemn promise.

Non-Catholics do not believe all revealed truths. Their very denial of the authority of the Church of God as sole teacher of revealed truth, as alone divinely warranted and divinely commissioned to teach all nations in all times, is a direct rejection of a revealed truth. For there is nothing more plainly or more emphatically, if we may use the expression, revealed than this truth.

But how far are non-Catholics culpable in refusing to believe in the divine mission of the Catholic Church divinely founded, and in what she proposes to our belief with infallible certainty? Do they refuse to believe because the truth is not duly expounded to them? Or are they unwilling to know the truth, lest they should believe? How many are in the way of salvation because of invincible ignorance? These and similar questions cannot be answered with absolute certainty, and therefore come under the heading *In Dubiis Libertas*.

Opinions are free where there can be only opinion, and there can be only opinion where the subject is debatable, where a greater or less degree of probability is the most that can be reached. And, here, if anywhere, there is need of charity. For we are all but too apt to over-rate each his own opinion. Each one has undoubtedly the right to form and to hold his opinion. But he should remember that the one who differs from him has an equal right to his opinion. And yet there are those who claim all freedom for their own opinions and make its sphere as wide as possible, but censure others who circumscribe their freedom within narrower limits. It is as if a man who used his freedom in frequenting the parks and promenades, should blame another for using his freedom in confining himself to his room.

We cannot find fault with another if he holds the opinion that, where the Catholic Church is established and where consequently the truth she teaches is accessible to all and easily attainable, very few non-Catholics are excusable for remaining in their errors. He quotes the words of our Lord to His apostles: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, going forth from thence, shake the dust from your feet for a testimony to them" (St Mark, vi., 11). "Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" (St. Mat., x., 15). If we allege prejudice as a sufficient plea for our "erring brethren" to-day, he will say the Jews were also prejudiced against the Apostles, and it did not excuse them. If we urge that the truths of faith are not properly nor sufficiently explained to non-Catholics, nor brought within their reach, he will add that our Lord explained His doctrine sufficiently to those who heard Him,

and yet many did not believe, and were consequently inexcusable, as He himself declared. It can be so now too.

But it is uncharitable to think so many are out of the right way, out of the way of salvation. We ought not to condemn them, but rather try to excuse them for their perhaps involuntary error. It cannot be uncharitable, he replies, to publish the truths God has revealed and belief in which He declares necessary for salvation. If He says faith in all is necessary, how can we say that faith in some will do? We cannot believe in the truth without condemning the opposite error. When our actions are opposed to our faith we have to condemn ourselves, and hear ourselves condemned by our best friend, the pastor of our souls. Are we uncharitable to ourselves? Is he uncharitable to us for warning us of our danger and frightening us away from the precipice? We condemn no one, he continues, we only help them not to be condemned. Our telling them the truth may, for all we know, be the means of their coming to embrace it. And even should they remain obstinate for the present, they may at some future time act on our warning, and we will have done a charitable act in thus endeavoring to rescue them from their danger. Our Lord expounded His doctrine to many whom He knew would reject it. The Apostles were told to "go teach all nations," and yet were given to understand beforehand that not all would "obey the truth," not even hear them, nor receive them. There is no one having a spark of charity who will not do all he can to bring non-Catholics to the true faith. But how will he, why should he, exert himself for this, if he believes that many Protestants are already in the right way? Is it not better to leave them in their prejudices, if prejudice can validly excuse them? Not thus did Catholics act toward the Arians, Nestorians, and other erring brethren. Is it only within the last three centuries that denying revealed truth or refusing to believe it is harmless? If so many of them are all right, there is no danger in marrying a non-Catholic. The children may be brought up non-Catholics, and their error is just as innocent as that of their father or mother. What difference does it make, many a Catholic will say? They are Christians as well as we. We must charitably suppose that they are honest in their convictions. Behold religious indifference, but one remove from loss of faith! To sum up, God alone knows who are and who are not excusable for not embracing the whole truth. If we know not whether we ourselves are worthy of love or hatred, much less can we say a large number of Protestants are all right.

But do you not believe Cardinals Manning and Newman, Fathers Faber and Lockhart, Dr. Ward and our own illustrious Brownson were sincere followers of the truth even before they became

Catholics? Yes, he rejoins, but do you not see that these same sincere followers of the truth became all of them Catholics? You say so many are *in good faith*. How do you know they are? And why be so positive on what you do not know? Charity for our erring brethren will not endow us with the attribute of God alone, the knowledge of the human heart. If we tell Protestants, in the name of charity, that very many of them are all right where they are, may we not deceive them in a matter of infinite importance? And is that charity? We are told "to see with the eyes of the Lord." Let those who can, do it. We cannot. God is merciful, and also just. Judgment belongs to Him. All we can with certainty affirm is that there is but one true form of Christianity, and can be but one. All the rest are counterfeits. Not believing in the Church of Christ is denying "the Pillar and Ground of truth," is denying the Spouse of Christ, the wisdom of Christ, the word of Christ and consequently the divinity of Christ. For if His word can fail, more yet, if it has failed, Christ is not God. Christ said His Church should never fail; Protestants say it has failed. Is that belief in His divinity?

We are told to follow the example of that "big-hearted Apostle, St. Paul," and are asked, "what plan would he lay out to reach them" (Protestants)? We for one do not know. But we do know something of his plan when he was on earth. Whilst making himself all to all, he said to the Galatians: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal., i., 8). Luther and Calvin and Henry VIII. were not St. Pauls, nor angels either. St. Paul said again: "O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth?" He might say the same now to the followers of false leaders. Father Harper answered Dr. Pusey's *Eirenikon* in a book whose significant title is "Peace Through the Truth." We say charity through the truth, conversion through the truth, liberty through the truth, salvation through the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. "The truth shall make you free" (St. John, viii., 32). "Male vivitur," says St. Augustine, "si de Deo non bene sentitur" (De Civ. Dei, L. V., 10).

We know we shall be set down by many as ungenerous, unkind, unpitying in our opinion. But we must, at the peril of our life eternal, believe all revealed truths as far as they are known to us, and our ignorance of them must not be culpable. Ignorance will not excuse us where we can and ought to know better. How can we presume so far as to say to others that for them it is enough to believe some revealed truths? God is not a respecter of persons, to say one thing for me, another for others, in matters of faith.

But our acknowledged motto is "In omnibus caritas." We leave you perfectly free to hold a very different opinion.

The words in our heading, "in dubiis libertas," may seem to some to involve a contradiction to the dictum of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free." If those that are in doubt are already free, they cannot be made free by the truth. Those that are free cannot be made free. But the contradiction vanishes if we consider for a moment that in doubtful things a person is free to take either side of two opposite views of a question. But that is not true freedom when a man is free to choose between two masters. In doubt there are two parties contending for possession of the bewildered mind, to neither of which it can deliver itself without forfeiting its native dignity and freedom. If a man is blind-folded or fettered, he cannot advance, nor is he free. Ignorance blinds-folds the eyes of the soul, doubt fetters it, on its way to heaven. Truth removes both impediments. The soul sees, it runs. The intellect knows the true, the will desires the good, and the whole being lays hold on the beautiful. Without knowing the true, man cannot love the good. But by loving the *Summum Bonum* "he is free and not detained," says the *Imitation*. True liberty, moral liberty, is "the power of willing what is right because it is right." He who is ignorant of the right cannot will it; and he who is in doubt does not know what to will. Like the sluggard he "willetteth and willetteth not."

But rightly or wrongly understood, the word liberty has a charm for most minds. Indeed, some are persuaded that they are doing a service to mankind by reducing to a minimum the class of *necessary* things (truths) where unity is insisted upon, leaving the rest to free opinion. Canon Bartolo, in his late work, "Criterions of Catholic Truth," as quoted by the *Catholic World*, for October last,¹ asks of the Sovereign Pontiffs, "when, for the future, they shall, in their prudence and wisdom exercise their infallible authority, to make use of the actual words of the Council of the Vatican; that is to say, that they shall declare that they speak *ex cathedra*, and that they address all the faithful." So chary is he of how much he is to believe. This request is very similar to that of a religious who would say to his superior, "when, in future, you want me to do anything, I wish you to tell me whether it is or is not 'in virtue of holy obedience' that you command me?"

But it is in favor of freedom, and it will be allowed, I suppose, to use all freedom in reasoning on his free opinion. If he wishes to be free to hold an opinion differing from the Pope, except when he speaks *ex cathedra*, surely we, however inferior to Canon Bar-

¹ This was written last January.

tolo, may claim the privilege of differing from one who never so speaks.

Reason has its claims on us as well as faith. We are told in Holy Scripture to render unto God our "reasonable service." Faith supposes reason, as reason supposes the senses. Without crediting our senses we cannot have faith, nor can we reason; for "Faith cometh by hearing" (Rom. x., 17), and we cannot form a single idea without a previous action of the senses. Faith cannot oppose reason; it can only go farther than reason. And there is nothing more reasonable than that finite reason should submit to the infinite Creator of reason, when reason itself affirms that He speaks, and that man should firmly believe all that He reveals.

Suppose now that the Pope issues a certain document condemning a certain line of conduct of Catholics in a certain country; are we, living in another country, free to pursue a perfectly similar line of conduct? We think not. Though he addressed only one country, morality, in its very nature, is for all countries when the circumstances are similar. If our consciences tell us the circumstances are similar, whether the papal pronouncement is formally *ex cathedra* or not, it is virtually so; it is so for us and for every one similarly circumstanced. It is not necessary for the Pope to declare formally the nature of his utterances when reason and common sense can determine for each one whether they are really binding on him or not. If the cap fits him he must wear it. Certainly this is the attitude of every good Catholic. Were the Pope to err in directing the morals of one country now, of another again, and then of a third, and so on, soon the whole body of the faithful, the whole Church, under the guidance of their Supreme Head, would be in error, which is contrary to the solemn promise of our Lord.

Again, suppose the Pope condemns certain propositions taught by a certain school of philosophy. Are we free to hold this doctrine as true, on the plea that the Pope did not speak *ex cathedra*? We think not again; for reason will tell us that what is logically connected with a truth of faith is necessarily included in our belief of that truth, and that which is logically opposed to that truth is necessarily condemned. We are accountable for the use of our reason in dealing with matters of faith and morals. If we hold that two and one make five, and yet believe in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but say that these make five, the dogmatic definition of the Trinity condemns our false principle in reasoning. And he who is empowered to define the one has the right to condemn the other. Again, if any one maintains in philosophy that the senses, in their normal state, are deceptive and cannot give us certain cognition, the Pope, who is the divinely appointed guardian

of the faith, has not only the right but the duty to condemn such philosophy. For that "faith cometh by hearing" is a revealed truth, which this philosophy contradicts. So also are we not free to hold or to teach *Ontologism*, condemned by Rome in 1861 and 1862, nor any of the forty propositions out of Rosmini's works, condemned a few years ago. No Catholic worthy of the name will set his private opinion above the decision of the Head of the Church in matters logically connected with faith or morals, such as are most questions of philosophy. He will not ask if such utterances are *ex cathedra*. The one who speaks *ex cathedra* says that these propositions cannot be held consistently with acceptance of *ex cathedra* pronouncements. That is enough. It will not do to profess a faith evidently in conflict with one's philosophy. This would be to suppose that faith and reason can contradict each other, that truths in the natural order can contradict those of the supernatural order. But no two truths, no matter of what order, can contradict each other, for God is the source of all truth, and He cannot contradict Himself. Truth is that which is; but that which is, is, and cannot at the same time not be, no matter how many or few, or what other things are. Rightly, then, does the Supreme Teacher in the Church condemn such propositions as are evidently inconsistent with truths of faith. They must be false.

"Reason," says Canon Bartolo, as quoted by the *Catholic World*, "if it finds a fact of nature or of history in opposition to a truth of revelation, is not obliged to deny the former; it will await a time when an agreement shall be established between them. This will happen either by the discovery of solid motives for doubting the reality of the (scientific or historical) fact in question, or, on the other hand, by demonstrating that what was deemed revealed truth was but simply the opinion of theologians."

But suppose that while awaiting an "agreement between them" the reasoner's time on earth is finished, what then? And suppose, farther, that the supposed (scientific or historical) fact is, in fact, no fact at all, even though science or history maintained it was; and that the revealed truth in question was in very truth revealed, and not merely the opinion of the theologians at all (suppositions that are, to say the least, very possible, not to say probable), what then? Has that reasoner made shipwreck of the faith or not? His faith is certainly not that which made the martyrs, nor yet the confessors of the Church. You may call it scientific or historic faith, any faith you please, but not divine faith. This faith is made of sterner stuff. The small catechism, issued by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, says: "Faith is a divine virtue, by which we firmly believe the truths which God has revealed." But how can he *firmly* believe a truth for the verification of which

he awaits the revelations of science or history? The catechism of the Council of Trent, explaining the first article of the Creed, says: "The meaning of these words (I believe in God) is this: I believe with certainty and without a shadow of doubt profess my belief." . . . And again: "The word 'believe,' therefore, does not mean 'to think,' 'to imagine,' 'to be of opinion,' but as the Sacred Scriptures teach, it expresses the deepest conviction of the mind, by which we give a firm and unhesitating assent to God revealing His mysterious truths. . . . Faith, therefore, excludes not only all doubt, but even the desire of subjecting its truths to demonstration."

What now becomes of Canon Bartolo's faith awaiting the "discovery of solid motives for doubting the reality of the scientific or historical fact," ere it pronounces for or against the revealed truth?

The Council of the Vatican has defined: "The Doctrine which God hath revealed hath not been proposed as some philosophical discovery to be perfected by the wit of man, but hath been entrusted to Christ's Spouse as a Divine Deposit to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared" (Sess. iii., chap. 4). But Canon Bartolo will have revealed truth stand or fall according as it does or does not pass the ordeal of some (supposed) fact of science or history. "He (Bartolo) teaches," says the *Catholic World*, "that in the canonization of saints the Church is, indeed, exercising her sovereign authority, but that the note of infallibility does not attach to the judgments thus made." A person may then believe that there are no saints at all in Heaven. If the Church can err in teaching that one saint is in Heaven, she can err in all. We need not believe that the Apostles are in Heaven, not even St. Paul, who was wrapt into the third Heaven while "in the body or out of the body," he knew not; nor St. Stephen, who saw "the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God;" nor any of the martyrs, nor St. Joseph, the Foster-father of our Lord, nor even the Immaculate Mother herself. For we can repeat with St. Augustine: "I would not believe the Gospel itself but for the authority of the Catholic Church."

And what becomes of the infallible decision of the Council of Trent, defining that "the saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men,—that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, help and assistance, to obtain favors from God, through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour" (Sess. 25)? How can the Church be infallible in declaring we may pray to the saints in Heaven, if she is fallible in declaring that they are in Heaven? Again, if miracles are insufficient to establish the sanctity of the saints beyond the possibility of error, how can the miracles of our

Lord be appealed to as proving His Divinity? Will God work miracles at the intercession of the canonized saints in order to deceive first the Vicar of Christ on earth and then all the faithful? And are we free to think that Sts. Gervase and Protase may have been in hell, for all we know, whilst a touch of their relics was restoring sight to a man that was blind, which miracle was witnessed by all the people of Milan, St. Augustine among them? But if the Church's decision in regard to canonized saints can deceive us, then may she have deceived us in the case of Sts. Gervase and Protase.

Again, is there no morality in question in our praying to saints in heaven who may not be there? Surely it cannot be morally right to honor with public veneration and with prayers for their intercession those whom God does not honor, but may have condemned. Nor can we think that that is the "Infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed," to use the words of the Vatican Council in defining the Pope's infallibility. How does Canon Bartolo, a private theologian, know that the canonization of saints is not included in what He willed to secure His Church from erring? The Vatican Council says, at the end of the First Constitution: "It sufficeth not to avoid heresy, unless those errors which more or less approach thereto are sedulously shunned." Does it not approach to the denying of the utility of praying to the saints, which utility was dogmatically affirmed by the Council of Trent, to hold, as Bartolo says we can, that we are not certain there are any saints in heaven? We have no other way of being certain of it than through the Church, but she, he says, in this can err. In fine, are we to accept his private opinion on the extent of Catholic freedom of opinion, or the statement of the Head of the Church? Pius IX., in a brief addressed to the Archbishop of Munich in 1863, laid down the Catholic principles on the subject of freedom of opinion, from which brief the twenty-second proposition condemned in the "Syllabus" was taken and runs thus: "The obligation under which Catholic teachers and writers lie, is restricted to those matters which are proposed for universal belief as dogmas of faith by the infallible judgment of the Church." Granting that this part of the brief was not *ex cathedra*, which Canon Bartolo cannot prove, still every Catholic will prefer the opinion of the Head of the Church to that of a private individual, especially when it coincides with the infallible statement of the Vatican Council quoted above. "It sufficeth not to avoid heresy unless those errors which are sedulously shunned."

Of the "Syllabus" Cardinal Manning writes: "During the preceding eighteen years, he (Pius IX.) had in numerous documents

and manifold acts condemned a multitude of intellectual errors of the day; and the ‘Syllabus’ is nothing more than a collection, from all the documents and acts of those eighteen preceding years, of the chief errors which he had already condemned. That ‘Syllabus’ contained eighty such errors, with their censures affixed, together with a reference to the former acts and documents in which the same condemnation had been already published. Now these eighty errors are partly in matters of faith, partly in matters of morals; in both of which the Catholic Church, and the Head of the Catholic Church also, by divine assistance, are infallible; that is, they are the ultimate interpreters of the faith, and the ultimate expositors of the law of God, and that not by the light of human learning only, but by the light of divine assistance, which secures from error. Under morals are also included a number of errors relating to the political state of the world, the Church, and its Head.” (“Characteristics from the Writings of Card. Manning,” p. 13.)

“The Pope,” says Canon Bartolo, “never declared it (Syllabus) infallible” (we quote from the *Catholic World*). But neither did he declare it was not infallible. “The Pontiff himself gave it its right name, a *list* of condemned propositions.” But his giving it the name of a list would not hinder it from containing infallible pronouncements. If they were infallible in the original documents their being collected into a list would not make them fallible. A faithful copy of the Scriptures is still the inspired Scriptures, of any document is that document.

“It was sent to the bishops by the papal Secretary of State, and only by *order* of the Pope, who, it is admitted, cannot delegate his infallibility.” There was no need to delegate his infallibility. The secretary could send what was infallibly pronounced and collected into a list and given him to send. The sender of a document may not even know its purport without this detracting from the validity of the document, provided it reaches its destination in safety. You might as well say that the letter-carrier affects the contents of the letter he carries. “And, finally, the references in the ‘Syllabus’ to papal documents of every grade of authority make these the source to which one must go for fixing the dogmatic character of the several condemnations.” But if these be dogmatic, the “Syllabus” will be so too, since it is only taken from them. And no matter how manifold the documents, the source from which they emanate is the same, the Head of the Church; and since they relate to faith and morals, they can be infallible. And since the Pope that issued them did not say they were not infallible, Canon Bartolo goes beyond his measure in saying that they are not.

We are told again: “The universality of the faithful, he (Bar-

tolo) holds, may have an erroneous opinion on a religious matter, as long as they do not hold it as revealed truth; though this state of things could not," he adds, "be long tolerated by the infallible authority of the Church." But if the "universality of the faithful," that is, the whole Church, with the toleration of the "infallible authority of the Church," has, even for a short time, an erroneous opinion on a religious matter, then has the Church of Christ erred in the most important of all matters, religion. But Jesus Christ promised it should never err for a short or for a long time. Therefore this proposition is false.

That "on the inspiration of the Holy Scripture Canon Bartolo holds views nearly identical with those of Cardinal Newman" is no proof that the views of either are sound. Cardinal Newman's views were met by overwhelming arguments at the time of their publication. It was no answer to these arguments to say that so short a time had been given to their preparation. The professor in question had spent his whole life, we may say, in studying such questions. What could hinder him from bringing forward better arguments than the Cardinal? Not the relative shortness of time he spent on them, certainly. For one man may in a week bring forward better arguments on a question than another after seven years' study. And this is the reply that has called forth from a popular writer the remark: "Could anything be more scathing? I sometimes wonder to what extent the professor has taken the lesson to heart."

"Canon Bartolo holds," says the *Catholic World*, "that inspiration extends only to matters of faith and morals, and to whatever else, including facts, has reference to faith and morals. This excludes from inspiration what Cardinal Newman has called *obiter dicta*, words, phrases, and sentences, which do not pertain to faith and morals." But let us hear what the Council of Trent holds. "The Council of Trent," says the "Manual of Catholic Theology," vol. i., p. 51, had declared that the whole of the books of the Old and New Testaments with all their parts were to be held as sacred and canonical." But if some "words, phrases, and sentences" were not inspired, they would be neither sacred nor canonical; and then the Council of Trent's declaration, "with all their parts," would be contradicted. "It is erroneous," continues the "Manual," "to assert that only certain portions of Scripture, for instance, matters of faith and morals or matters specially mentioned as revealed, are inspired. The Catholic doctrine is that the whole substance of the Sacred Writings has God for its author, and must be believed with divine faith." There is no place here for *obiter dicta*. "St. Thomas had taught long before that it was heresy to say that Holy Scripture is false, or to assert that a single point clearly contained in

it, *e.g.*, that Samuel was the son of Elcana, is an error." ("Man. of Cath. Theol.", vol. i., p. 56.)

But let us suppose Canon Bartolo's views accepted and acted upon. How is he or any private individual to know that only what relates to faith and morals was inspired, that the so-called *obiter dicta* were not inspired? It belongs to the Church or its infallible Head to declare this, but she has rather declared the contrary, "that the whole of the books . . . with all their parts were to be held as sacred and canonical." If no private individual is free to interpret Scripture pertaining to faith and morals otherwise than as the Church interprets it, neither can he determine how much pertains to faith and morals, and how much does not. If he is incompetent for the one, he must be so likewise for the other.

But let us suppose this liberty granted, and see how Holy Scriptures will fare from it, now that each individual is free to leave out what seems to him not to appertain to faith or morals. Who will say what relation to faith or morals has a great part of the Apocalypse, whose interpretation has, to a great extent, baffled the ingenuity of the most learned in the Church, and of which St. Jerome says: "The Apocalypse has as many mysteries as words, or rather mysteries in every word?" And St. John ends it with these words: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city." Or will it be said that this threat, too, is among the *obiter dicta*, a mere fancy of the old man to frighten children and simple folks, but not to be heeded by strong minds enamored of freedom? Some may argue that much of the discourse of our Lord after the Last Supper, for instance His Prayer, has no connection with faith or morals, and may consequently be classed with *obiter dicta*. And surely the long account of the wanderings and shipwreck, and hair-breadth escapes of St. Paul, can have no bearing on the faith and morals of Christians; and how can the Epistle to Philemon, requesting him to forgive his fugitive slave, Onesimus, be other than *obiter dicta*? With this principle in hand, we can take as much from the Holy Bible as any free-thinking Protestant has ever taken. O Liberty! What havoc may be perpetrated in thy name!

"In case of conflict between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in a matter of mixed jurisdiction, reason corroborated by faith will recognize, he (Bartolo) maintains, the distinct domains of the two powers, and will obey the competent authority within the limits of the power belonging to it; such obedience will be paid either to one of the two, or to both, within their respective jurisdictions." (*Catholic World*, October, 1890.)

This proposition seems to forget the words of our Lord, "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and

love the other, or he will hold to the one and despise the other" (Luke xvi., 13); or the latter part of it forgets the former, "In case of conflict." If there is a conflict between the two powers, it is absolutely impossible to obey both. If we adhere to one of two contraries, we must reject the other. We cannot say yes and no to the same proposition. When there was a conflict between the two authorities, millions of martyrs went to death rather than obey the civil authorities. Our Lord said, "He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." In case of conflict, then, one must obey the ecclesiastical authorities. If obedience will be rendered "to both within their respective jurisdictions," this is evident proof that there is no conflict between them. The Church enjoins upon all the faithful the strict obligation of rendering obedience to all lawful authority, civil and ecclesiastical, within their respective jurisdictions; and as this is a moral obligation, it belongs to him who is infallible in what pertains to faith and morals to determine the limits of both jurisdictions. When the civil authorities in Germany, some years ago, pushed their jurisdiction beyond its just limits, the Catholics, to a man, disobeyed the civil authorities; and now the civil authorities themselves are approving their disobedience by retracing their own steps and, as far as they can, undoing what they did. A Christian is not free to determine for himself to what extent he will obey one or other of the authorities or both. If there is no conflict between them, it is determined already; he must obey both. If there is a conflict, he must hear his divinely appointed guide in faith and morals, the Church and her infallible Head.

Canon Bartolo's "demand for liberty from the encroachments of private theologians, setting themselves up as censors of their brethren," comes hard against himself, who is a private theologian censuring the free opinion that does not take so wide a course as his. We that are not theologians will take the liberty denied to them, and ask who is the encroacher, the new comer or the old possessor, the one who broaches strange opinions, or those who hold what has been held throughout the centuries by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church? If he is free to minimize the domain of *necessary things* in which unity is required, we are free to minimize that of *doubtful things* in which there is liberty of opinion. And if he censures us for our free opinion, that we are to believe much, he cannot complain of our censuring him for his free opinion that we are to believe little. If he acts the censor, we but follow his example. The advocate of freedom, he denies his own doctrine by constituting himself the censor of free opinion. But let us remember our motto, *In omnibus caritas*.

There is one free opinion expressed on page 119 of the *Catholic World*, to which those whom it may concern might lawfully offer

a free opinion to the contrary, and that, too, in perfect charity. "Nothing so ill-becomes learned orthodoxy as disregard for the sensibilities of honest but unenlightened Christians; this may be called the stupidity of learning. To this vicious union of erudition in doctrine and stupidity in teaching is sometimes joined a cruel contempt for the weaknesses of the little ones of Christ, and this is the criminal pride of learned orthodoxy."

We are fortunate in being orthodox without being learned. But not all learned orthodoxy is proud, nor is all criminal pride confined to learned orthodoxy. All orthodoxy must be intolerant of error, as all truth is; and this intolerance is perfectly consistent with charity. No man has a right to be offended at a simple, plain and strong statement of truth. This is a homage due to truth, and he is not worthy to possess it who is not ready to pay this homage when there is question of religious truth, or the truths of faith. St. Paul charges Timothy: "Preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, entreat, rebuke with all patience and doctrine." There is no caution here not to hurt the "sensibilities" of his hearers.

"Would that Catholics of narrow views, and devoid of scientific gifts," writes Canon Bartolo, "learned how to respect in discussion the opinions of their brethren." And would, say we, that Catholics of broad views, and *chock-full* (!) of scientific gifts, learned how to respect in discussion the narrower views of their brethren. The broad views are not infallible any more than the narrow views, and yet, while pleading for charity and forbearance, we hear the broad views style the narrow views as "the insolence of theologians who would impose their doctrines upon man," while the theologians themselves disclaim any such imposition. It is not insolence at all in Canon Bartolo to try to impose his doctrines (views) upon men.

Again his own words come against him: "The private theologian who seeks to impose his views upon others without the guarantee of infallible authority assails liberty, and makes it impossible for the human understanding to possess itself of the truth; he is guilty of treason against humanity." A private theologian himself, without the guarantee of infallible authority, he tries to curtail the liberty of orthodox theologians, even to the extent of having them connive at error, as the following extract will show: "This theological process extends to the interpretation in a Catholic sense of expressions which are capable of a heterodox meaning. There can be no doubt that the science of theology demands precision of language, as does every other science—exactness of expression and reasoning; but among the most orthodox theological conceptions an inexact idea will often slip in, one which an orthodox theologian cannot, after mature consideration, accept.

On such accidental ideas the theologian of good sense will by no means fix his attention, or rather he will give them an orthodox interpretation, knowing, as he does, the soundness of his colleague's orthodoxy.... To call in question the faith of such a theologian, or to refuse him the praise due to the merit of his treatise, besides being a fault against charity, may have the effect of so frightening him off as to destroy the fruitfulness of his intelligence, or, at least, to render it sterile, turning him away from researches which he has undertaken in the field of divine science."

He wants the orthodox theologian who, after mature consideration, cannot accept certain ideas, to pay no attention to these heterodox ideas, but "rather give them an orthodox interpretation;" and with these heterodox ideas he must know "the soundness of his colleague's orthodoxy." How can a man's orthodoxy be sound, if his ideas are heterodox? And why should he give an orthodox interpretation to ideas which, after mature consideration, he cannot accept as orthodox? In every science a person is at *liberty* to expose the inexactness of a writer's ideas; nay, is expected to do it, for the sake of that science to which he devotes himself. It is only in theology, the queen of the sciences, that a man must pass over a writer's erroneous ideas, and "to refuse him the praise due to the merit of his treatise" is "a fault against charity." The Holy Scriptures tell us: "Praise not a man before he is dead." And why praise a treatise having in it heterodox ideas? It deserves no praise. The one who charitably points out the errors (just what Canon Bartolo does not want) renders it possible for the author to receive praise, on condition that he corrects the errors. Canon Bartolo should speak *ex cathedra* before men will believe it uncharitable in an orthodox theologian to point out what is heterodox in the writings of a fellow-theologian. "Frighten him off!" If he has not the humility to hear his errors exposed, and love of truth enough to correct them, and gratitude for the favor of exposing them, the sooner he is frightened off the better for himself and for mankind at large. The world has enough of erroneous opinions already, without "the fruitfulness of his intelligence" giving it still more. Better his intelligence be sterile than productive of error, and that he turn himself to something more suited to his capacity than pursue "the researches which he has undertaken in the field of divine science." That field will be all the more productive of the good grain of truth the more it is weeded of such incompetent workmen. This receives additional force from the fact that they will not have their works purged of their errors.

B. B.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—Canon Bartolo's book has been placed on the Index by the Sacred Congregation of the Index; and the same Sacred Congregation informs us that he received the condemnation with due submission.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

No. I. DESTINY—PREPARATION.

IT is an auspicious year, which now dawns upon a world already predisposed to recognize the grandeur and appreciate the value of the achievements and services rendered to mankind by one whose memory has waited four hundred years for the full measure of human justice. Christopher Columbus, discoverer of a New World, was the most fortunate and the most unfortunate of men. It is difficult to say which was the greater, his glory or his sorrow. A gladsome thing it is that now his misfortunes exist only in history; the future is one of unalloyed benediction. While nations honor his memory and sovereigns come together to proclaim his exalted virtues and transcendent services, a nation, whose country he revealed to mankind, and which would be proud to bear his name, offers a national homage at his shrine, and now great cities become monumental with his memorials. Literature, too, embalms the hero's name and deeds in choicest forms of poetry, history, drama and panegyric, while every journal, review and magazine published in this favored land will signalize the quarto-centennial year with fervid tributes to the great discoverer. This REVIEW will cordially unite in the universal acclaim, and will make its issues of 1892 so many grateful souvenirs of the discoverer of America.

Christopher Columbus was a man of destiny. Not that he was destined from eternity by an invincible and inexorable necessity to be the discoverer of the new world, so that no other man could possibly achieve that grand result; but that he was so fitted for the task, so pre-eminently endowed with the virtues and knowledge and courage necessary to its accomplishment, that he saw so clearly in himself the man that was to attain this great result, comprehended it and dedicated himself unchangeably to it so ardently, that, in the natural order at least, he was the man destined to perform the act. He came to know and feel assured so well of his destined part on earth, that from an early time in his life he drew such inspiration from the altar of prayer and grace, it was evident

“Thither he
Will come to know his destiny.”—*Shakespeare.*

But Christopher Columbus was the man of destiny in a higher sense, in that he was a providential man, one destined, in the mer-

ciful designs of Providence, to reveal the New World to the Old, to carry the Cross over the trackless ocean to unknown peoples, and to bring Christendom face to face with the heathen tribes and nations of the earth. Columbus regarded himself as the chosen one of God for the fulfillment of great undertakings. After his third voyage, and while awaiting, in Spain, the authority and sanction of Ferdinand and Isabella for undertaking his fourth voyage, he prepared a most remarkable work, entitled "Collection of Prophecies Concerning the Recovery of Jerusalem and the Discovery of the Indies (America)," in which he applied, with great acumen, learning and logic, to the New World and to himself, many of the ancient prophecies of the Old Testament. That learned Italian publicist, Francisco Tarducci (Mr. Brownson's English translation), referring to the letter addressed by the admiral to the Spanish sovereigns, and accompanying the "Collection of Prophecies" which he sent to them, writes: "He freely asserted his conviction that he had been chosen by God, *from his earliest years*, to carry out these two great undertakings—the discovery of the New World and the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. For this purpose God had led him to embrace a sailor's life, in which one is naturally inclined to study to penetrate the secrets of nature, and he had, in addition, a spirit of curiosity which caused him to read every sort of chronicles and books of philosophy. While meditating on these books, his mind had been opened by God 'as by a hand,' and it was then that he discovered a way by sea to the Indies, and felt himself all on fire with the desire of opening it. 'Then it was,' he says, 'that I sought Your Majesties. Every one that heard of my undertaking ridiculed it; all the knowledge I had acquired was of no use to me. I spent ten years at your august court in discussions with persons of great merit and profound learning, who, after much argument, ended by declaring my projects to be chimerical. Your Majesties alone had faith and constancy. Who can doubt that it was the light derived from the Sacred Scriptures that enlightened your minds with the same rays as mine?'" In this same letter, so remarkable and characteristic of the man, he alleges the wondrous methods of the Holy Ghost in guiding the minds of the chosen instruments of Providence in the knowledge of their vocations and in the means of their accomplishment. He learnedly and ably sets forth definite canons for interpreting the sacred Scriptures, based upon the writings of St. Augustine, St. Thomas, St. Isidore and Gerson. He based the arguments of his extraordinary discourse upon the divine assurance that "before the consummation of the world all that has been written shall be fulfilled." He then presents *seriatim*, and with great cogency, the grand chain of prophecies relating, as he contended,

to the two great aspirations of his life, the Discovery of the New World and the Redemption of the Holy Land, and follows these up with an elaborate and cogent series of reasonings sustained by arguments, logical propositions, interpretations and citations of authorities of sacred writers, and especially from the Fathers of the Church. When this extraordinary document, in the preparation of which it is said he was aided by a learned ecclesiastical and theological sympathizer and friend, was completed, the author sent it for revision and correction to Father Gaspare Goricio, a Carthusian monk of Seville famous for his theological learning. The accomplished and astute theologian returned the document to its illustrious author, with answer that he found nothing to correct and nothing to add to it, and expressing himself with wonder at its learning and research and with praise for its piety and devotion. Columbus entertained these sentiments to the end of his life, for in the most solemn act of his life, his last will and testament, he devoutly commences with these words: "In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, who inspired me with the idea, and afterwards made it perfectly clear to me, that I should navigate and go to the Indies from Spain, by traversing the ocean westwardly." The same sentiments are reiterated in many of the letters and writings of the admiral. This was certainly the inspiration that carried him through so many obstacles, trials, disasters and misfortunes to success and glory.

But it was not he alone that entertained these sentiments. Many of his contemporaries and many learned historians of subsequent periods and of our own times have fully sympathized with them. It is well known that Columbus addressed several letters to the Sovereign Pontiffs on the subject of his discoveries and the consequent crusade for the delivery of the Holy Land, in which he always alluded to his providential and apostolic mission, and it is a well-established fact that he received repeated and renewed encouragement from Rome. It is now one of the movements in honor of the approaching Columbian celebrations, that our present Holy Father has appointed a learned scholar and theologian near his person to collect from the Vatican archives and publish the proofs that it was owing in a great measure to the assurances, encouragements and benedictions of the Holy See that Columbus was sustained and inspired with hope and perseverance to prosecute his great work to such glorious and successful results, and that the chief motive that inspired Columbus was an ardent zeal for the conversion of heathen nations to Christianity. Some of the facts on this head will be given by us hereafter.

So also in his own days there were many other learned and pious ecclesiastics and laymen, who united with him in the belief that he

held a special mission from Divine Providence to reveal to mankind the existence of the New World. Amongst his sympathizers were eminent persons of different countries—persons of high birth, distinguished rank and rare abilities. The learned and famous scientist and lapidary, Jayme Ferrer, whom Isabella herself had introduced to Columbus, only voiced the sentiments of many other learned and pious scholars and Christians of his day when, in his letter to the queen on January 27, 1495, he thus referred to Columbus: "I believe that in its deep, mysterious designs, Divine Providence selected him as its agent in this work, which I look upon as the introduction and preparation of things which the same Divine Providence has determined to make known to us for its own glory and the salvation and happiness of the world." And, on August 5th of the same year, he thus addresses Columbus himself: "I behold in this a great mystery; divine and infallible Providence sent the great Thomas (the apostle) from the west to the east to preach our Holy Catholic faith in the Indies, and has sent you, Señor, by the opposite way, from the east to the west, till, by God's will, you reached the utmost limits of Upper India, in order that the inhabitants might learn those truths, which their progenitors cared not to receive from the preaching of St. Thomas. And thus are fulfilled the words of the prophet: 'Their sound is gone out through all the earth.'" And again in the same letter: "In your mission, Señor, you seem an apostle, a messenger of God, to spread His name in unknown lands." The great and learned Agostino Giustiniani, in his famous Polyglot Psalter, sustains the opinion of Jayme Ferrer as to the divine mission of Columbus; and Father Ventura said, "Columbus is the man of the Church."

Our own gifted and eloquent countryman, Washington Irving, writes in strains of respect, if not of sympathy, of this profoundly religious and confiding view which Columbus so honestly took and so fervently felt in the heaven-inspired mission which he was sent to perform. "These ideas," he says, "so repeatedly and solemnly and artlessly expressed by a man of the fervent piety of Columbus show how truly his discovery arose from the working of his own mind, and not from information furnished by others. He considered it a divine intimation, a light from heaven, and the fulfilment of what had been foretold by our Saviour and the prophets. Still, he regarded it as a minor event, preparatory to the great enterprise, the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. He pronounced it a miracle effected by heaven to animate himself and others to that holy undertaking, and he assured the sovereigns that if they had faith in his present as in his former proposition, they would be assuredly rewarded with equally triumphant success. He conjured them not to heed the sneers of such

as might scoff at him as one unlearned, as an ignorant mariner, a worldly man, reminding them that the Holy Spirit works not merely in the learned, but also in the ignorant. And then, after showing how much the religious views and proposals of Columbus were consonant with the sentiments and convictions of the times and of the country in which he lived, the accomplished author proceeds to say: "There was nothing, therefore, in the proposition of Columbus that could be regarded as preposterous, considering the period and circumstances in which it was made, though it strongly illustrates his own enthusiastic and visionary character. It must be recollectcd that it was meditated in the courts of the Alhambra, among the splendid remains of Moorish grandeur, where, but a few years before, he had beheld the standard of the faith elevated in triumph above symbols of infidelity. It appears to have been the offspring of one of those moods of high excitement, when, as has been observed, his soul was elevated by the contemplation of his great and glorious office; when he considered himself under divine inspiration, imparting the will of Heaven, and fulfilling the high and holy purposes for which he had been predestined."

The very names which our hero bore from his infancy have been regarded as evidences of his Christian Apostolate; Colombo, a Dove; and Christopher, the Christ-Bearer. He has been compared to the prophets and patriarchs of old, and many points of resemblance have been discovered between them. He has been compared with Moses, who, fifteen hundred years before the advent of Christ gave a law to the oppressed people of God, led them out of the land of bondage, instructed them in the true religion and worship of God, and consolidated and isolated them from the contamination of idolatry; Columbus in like manner and like another Moses, fifteen hundred years after the coming of the Saviour, extended the boundaries of the known earth, restored the union and brotherhood of all men, and enlarged the realms of Christendom. Even Columbus himself likened himself unto Moses and to David. Like Moses his name was highly symbolical; both were forty years of age when they commenced the execution of their respective missions, which they received from the same God; and both left wife and family heroically to do the will of God with perfection. While the sea opened to give Moses and his followers a safe passage over, the great ocean, "the Sea of Darkness," smoothed its tempestuous bosom and became calm and pleasant for the Christ-Bearer to reach the New World he was seeking. While Moses promulgated the Law of the Covenant, Columbus announced that of the New Testament, and while the former prophetically appealed to the sign of the Cross on the

post in the form of the Greek letter *Tau*, Columbus triumphed by the Cross, which he emblazoned on his banners, erected with huge trees cut from the virgin forests wherever he landed, and which he bore on his breast; Moses received the ingratitude, the opposition, the violence of his people, while the inheritance of Columbus were desertion, destitution, revolts, chains, imprisonment, calumnies, obscurity and neglect. While Moses was denied the privilege of entering the promised land, Columbus never saw the Indies nor Asia, which he sought, knew not the very Continent which he discovered; and the very world which he revealed, received its name from another.

The Rev. Arthur George Knight, of the Society of Jesus in England, opens his beautiful and learned "Life of Columbus" with that devout and favorite prayer of the great admiral :

Jesu cum Maria
Sit nobis in via.

From his intelligent and fervid pages we can but learn how powerfully Columbus grasped the fundamental truth that the actions of men have their meaning and value from reference to the life of God Incarnate; he saw in his own name, the Christ-Bearer, a symbol of his work; how Columbus, in his famous vision, received a message from God, a solemn admonition, and the restoration of his energies, at the moment they were most needed, on the eve of his shipwreck; and how the vicissitudes of a life of peril, his repeated rescues from the jaws of death, constitute a standing miracle of a special Providence visibly exerted in his behalf.

The tendency of modern writers, those who belong to non-Catholic schools, is to regard the life and achievements of Columbus as the mere results of human genius and courage, great and invaluable though they are, as the splendid development and successful execution of theories long entertained, and by him for the first time visibly applied, without any recognition of a providential mission, or divine vocation. Even the sympathetic Mr. Irving reveals insuperable aversion to recognize anything providential in the life of Columbus, while he acknowledges that the admiral's belief in his own divine mission furnished him the chief motive, and inward stimulus to face every danger and suffering in executing his self-recognized divine vocation. So, too, Mr. Winsor, of Boston, in his work on Columbus which will have been published before this article reaches the readers of the REVIEW, treats the whole achievement of the discovery of America as the successful and brilliant culmination of a theory recognizing the sphericity of the earth, which had been first broached six hundred years before Christ, and which Columbus was the first

of philosophers and scientists to put into visible and tangible realization. He strings the whole history of the discovery of the New World upon a faint tradition among a learned few, dim in origin, scarcely discernible in centuries, with here and there a slight recognition, accepted by few if any, and finally discarded by the learned generally, and by the entire mass of mankind. Columbus, on the other hand, felt his mind enlightened from on high, his steps guided by divine Providence, a religious support and ever-flowing renewal of strength and resources under the most appalling difficulties and misfortunes, a perseverance under unparalleled denials, delays, obstructions, and injustices, which we can but recognize, as he did, to be a supernatural grace. The Count de Lorgues takes a higher view when he states that, "Columbus possessed, visibly, the three theological virtues; he practiced constantly the four cardinal virtues; the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost were apparent in his life, and we find God admirable in him, as He is always in His Saints." And again this Christian writer says, "Evidently God chose Christopher Columbus as a Messenger of Salvation."

It is undeniable, indeed it is a grand and luminous feature in his extraordinary and unparalleled career, that he felt the inadequacy of human resources to sustain himself under the ordeal through which he had to pass; he was frequently on the point of utter failure and collapse, at one time engulfed in a deep lethargy, at another shipwrecked, and at another sick unto death, and in every crisis he felt and recognized in his recovery the direct hand of a superintending and sustaining Providence. Columbus believed in his own providential mission, and it was this belief which carried him onward to the most glorious success. This is the key to a proper understanding of his life and character, the selection of characteristic features in his life, the motive-power of a splendid career. From this it will be seen how important, how necessary, it is for us to present this point in some detail, for now, as we are about to commence the more historic part of our treatise, the historian cannot but recognize as we proceed with his glory, how every circumstance, fact, apparent accident, and every surrounding of the man from his birth, evidently seemed to unite in preparing him for what he persistently avowed was his providential call and divine mission. It would be impossible to comprehend the life of Columbus in any other light than that which is shed by his own thoughts, aspirations, prayers, visions and avowed impulses and resources. Without this recognition his life is an enigma. It is true that he was a profound student of science and of nature, and that he followed scientific methods; but why was it that other scientists, even more learned than he, could never undertake or accomplish the

great discovery ; why were they all astonished and incredulous at his theories and still more at his achievements ? Again, it was not the learning of Columbus, nor his scientific attainments, that met the real difficulties of his crucified life ; it was the strength of his faith, the force of his religious hope, the power of his prayer, the virtues of his character, his incessant appeals to heaven, his recognition of a providential mission, his obedience to the divine call, the whole moral and devout momentum of his pious personality, that enabled him to practice an unparalleled perseverance under unequalled difficulties and disasters, to overcome every social, moral and political obstacle, to meet even the conscientious but mistaken objections of devout churchmen and divines, to bear or overcome the insults, intrigues, malice and calumnies of his enemies, and to be silent under the ingratitudo of his own sovereign. It can be noticed by the intelligent and gentle reader, that Providence from his birth and throughout his manhood, as we detail his singular and fascinating history, surrounded him by the circumstances which prepared him, both as an apostle and as a scientist for the successful accomplishment of his great mission on earth. What was his preparation for his mission ? The history of the first half of his life will show.

Although a fierce contest has been waged among historians and scholars as to the precise place of birth of Christopher Columbus, now the struggle has been definitely decided in favor of the proud city of Genoa, Genoa the Magnificent. This beautiful city had sprung from the sea, derived its support from the sea, and its glory was drawn from the sea ; a city almost cut off from the inland and from the pursuits of the land by a chain of high mountains surrounding it in the rear, whilst its majestic palaces, temples, fortifications and noble streets turned incessantly towards the water, and looking across the graceful semi-circle of the harbor, intuitively schooled its gallant men and agile youth to look ardently and ambitiously to the sea. The Genoese were essentially and from necessity a maritime people

“ Whose ready sails, with every wind can fly
And make cov’nant with the inconstant sky ;
Whose oaks secure as if they there took root,
Who tread on billows with a steady foot.”—Waller.

The ordinary life of a Genoese was commenced from early youth and spent on the water. It was a daily school for fascinating danger and bold adventure. Particularly was this the case at the time of the birth and boyhood of Columbus. For while long controversies were carried on by critics and biographers as to the time of his birth ; this question has been settled in favor of the year of

grace, 1436. At this period of time it was, as had been the case for centuries, when the battles of Christian Europe against the Turks and Mussulmen, when struggles of merchantmen on the high seas with outlaws and corsairs, when incessant broils and contests with the Mediterranean pirates, fired the hearts and aroused the ambition of every spirited and generous Genoese youth. The atmosphere which young Columbus breathed, the stirring tales of maritime adventure which the aged and retired sailors then told beneath the vines that crowned the neighboring hills, and in the vineyards tilled by veteran retired tars, which formed the traditional literature of his youth, the daily sight of gallant fleets of men-of-war and armed merchantmen going out the majestic harbor to join in the dangerous fray or glorious battle, the very sight of sea and smell of salt, the ozone of the ocean, and the seafaring heredity sucked in with his mother's milk, the very school books all historic of battle and illustrated with naval contests, all united to inspire the mind and heart of Christopher Columbus with a love of the water from his infancy. The providence, whose call to mighty deeds and sublime achievements he obeyed in after life, could not have cast his youthful lot in a school more fitted to form the character of the future discoverer of worlds. The generous boy was equal to his opportunities—for he was a precocious sailor, and made his first voyage to sea at the age of fourteen.

But there was another training, deeper and more beneficent which Columbus received during the first fourteen years of his life, which ran parallel with his seafaring aspirations, which girded his loins and his soul with the armor of faith, purity, and virtue, and which made him first the Christian sailor, then the Christian discoverer, admiral, and apostle. He was the son of Domenico Columbus and Susana Fontanarossa. The Italian form of the name was Colombo, which signified a dove. His parents were in humble circumstances, though not destitute, and it is confidently stated that his ancestors belonged to the nobility. His father followed the trade of a wool comber, and when his family had grown to number four sons, Christopher, the oldest, Bartholomew, Pellegrino, and James, and one daughter, he prudently rented out his own house and took the lease of another and humbler home, No. 166 Mulincento street, having the Benedictines as his landlords and his neighbors. The oldest of the sons of Domenico Colombo was baptized soon after his birth in the ancient Benedictine church of St. Stephen, which as a venerable relic is pointed out to this day to reverent tourists, and here the future admiral received the highly symbolical name of Christopher, the Christ Bearer, a name which was truly prophetic of the brilliant services he was to render in after life to the Christ, the Incarnate, the Redeemer, the Saviour.

Christopher and his brothers assisted the good and pious father in his trade as a wool comber, in which also he had hired assistance and an apprentice. But Domenico Colombo did not claim the entire services of his oldest son at the shop, but made every effort to give him an education in keeping with his conspicuous and rare abilities. After bestowing upon him some elementary instruction, he sent him at the tender age of ten years to the University of Pavia. At this gentle age, and at this famous university, the oldest son of the Colombos studied the elements of mathematics, physics, astronomy, Latin, and mental and moral philosophy, for such were the studies for which this noted school was famous, and such too were the principal attainments of Christopher Columbus, until, in the working out of his world-wide career, he added navigation and seamanship. While it is not claimed that Christopher mastered these studies, the fact of his spending two years at the university shows the precocity of his mind and points out the providence that gave a scientific trend to his mind and life. At the age of twelve he returned to his father's shop and to the labors of a wool comber. It was during these years that he received the Sacraments of Confirmation, which made him through life a soldier of the Cross, and of the Holy Eucharist, by which he became in fact, as in name, the Bearer of the Christ. The family of Colombo had an excellent name for honesty, virtue and intelligence. Their ancestral traditions, running back to noble blood in Lombardy, Piedmont, the Plaisantin, and Liguria, preserved the striking virtues and loyalty of the Middle Ages, and these qualities were perpetuated at the humble fireside of the wool comber of Genoa.

Various authors have discussed the interesting question as to the nature and extent of Columbus' education when he embraced a seafaring life at the age of fourteen. While some have limited his attainments to the elements of grammar and arithmetic, others have credited him with elementary studies in science, and with finally, as years passed on, an entire devotion to the science of navigation. His son Fernando, his historian, making the most of the slender fact that he studied at Pavia, with justice claims for his father the additional accomplishments of astronomy and geometry, geography, cosmography, and drawing. It is claimed that already he was fond of reading works on cosmography, and that he even then commenced drawing maps, which in after life proved his only protection from hunger and nakedness. He claims, therefore, that he was a student at the University of Pavia, which many others have doubted or denied. It is certain, however, that the University of Pavia has, in recent years, erected a monument to commemorate its own honorable association with Columbus as one of

its students, and Monsignor Rocco Cocchia, who had the glory of finding the remains of Columbus at San Domingo, sent a portion of them to the University of Pavia, in recognition of its claim to be the Alma Mater of the admiral.

It is to be regretted that this seafaring life of Columbus, from the time of his embarking as a sailor about the year 1449, when fourteen years old, to the year 1470, when he arrived in Portugal at the age of thirty-five, is involved in so much obscurity. That he was a youth of piety and faith, of integrity and truth, of energy and fidelity, is well known from the facts that these qualities naturally formed the training of a youth fresh from the shrine of a good Catholic home, and that he preserved his purity and devout character through the dangerous ordeal of twenty years or more of seafaring life, and at Lisbon, in the prime of life, he was a man of profound faith, tender piety and religious zeal. This was a rare and precious inheritance to preserve through such a life as a sailor and a naval officer, in those times especially, and in those countries, he was compelled to lead. It was a life of danger, hardships, and suffering, one of daring adventure, of exciting risk, of rude and reckless encounter, of danger to health and limb, and of constant peril to life. A sailor's companions and friends were as reckless and desperate as the enemies he had to encounter, and the danger of becoming like unto them was imminent. His first service as a sailor, humble and laborious, exposed him to the violence of tempests and of the waves, to the dangers of battle and personal encounter, to wounds, privations, suffering, and exposures of every kind. The conditions of the times, that turbulent and reckless period, show what must have been the life of Christopher Columbus for a period of twenty years. The numerous States along the Mediterranean, and especially those of Italy, were turbulent in their habits and reckless in their careers; each one seemed to be at perpetual war with its neighbors; alliances were sometimes formed of several weaker ones against a more powerful neighbor; treachery and intrigue were freely resorted to, and piracy was openly practised and universally licensed. The high seas became the theatre of perpetual warfare, the ships of each petty state were constantly engaged in chase or battle with those of a neighboring state. They depredated like pirates on each other's commerce; piracy supplanted commerce, and no ship afloat was ever at rest or at peace. Fleets of privateers roamed the sea in search of booty or adventure, and were ready to enter the service of any belligerent or adventurer that provided the richest plunder, the most thrilling service, or the most reckless fighting. Petty lords or chieftains maintained fleets of their own, under pretense of defending their domains,

but ready at any moment to avenge an offence real or imaginary, to pounce upon richly laden merchantmen, or to take part in any public or private war. The danger to which merchantmen were constantly exposed, from the practice of universal piracy, caused them to carry armaments and fighting equipments like men-of-war. To this lawless state of the sea, among the maritime States of Europe, was added the incessant appearance on these scenes of blood, pillage, and death, of Mahometan corsairs and fleets of infidels, bent on destroying all they encountered and putting to the sword every Christian antagonist; and this feature in the tumultuous state of the seafaring life added danger and zest to the life they led, and was accompanied by the rancor and woes of religious strife and race extermination. Such was the stirring school in which Columbus was trained to be a sailor, a seaman, a navigator, a commander, a future discoverer. We have no details of this formative and preparative period of his life. We know, however, that at the age of twenty-four, he had reached the rank of a captain, and commanded a ship in the service of Jean of Anjou, who, with the aid of France, was struggling to assert his sovereignty over the kingdom of Naples against Alfonso V. of Aragon. Genoa took sides with Jean of Anjou and Charles VII. of France, and a combined fleet of French, Neapolitan and Genoese, for four years spread terror among the squadrons of Aragon. It was in 1459 that Columbus became an active participant in the war, and from his own pen we learn how he bore himself in the personal service, the special commission, and in the chase confided to him by his chief. "King René happened to send me to Tunis to capture the galley Fernandina; and arriving at the head of the island of San Pietro in Sardinia, I learned that there were two ships and a carrac with the galley. At this my crew were so troubled that they determined to proceed no further, but to return to Marseilles for another vessel and more men. Seeing that I had no other means of forcing them, I pretended to yield to their wishes, and altered the point of the compass, and spread sail, it being then evening. The next morning at sunrise, we found ourselves off Carthagena, while all were firmly convinced we were sailing towards Marseilles." This incident shows the characteristic courage of Columbus in seeking an encounter with a force three times greater than his own, a courage for which he was distinguished through life, and to which he owed much of his success. The stratagem, by which he forced his timid crew to meet the foe against their will, casts light upon another and more pregnant and perilous and glorious period of his life and successful career, when, in his first Atlantic voyage, that resulted in the discovery of America, he altered the reckoning of the distance from Spain, and thus held his

panic-stricken crews to the westward course, and to ultimate success, and imperishable renown.

Not only was it claimed in behalf of Columbus, especially by his son and historian, Fernando Columbus, that his ancestors were of noble estate and blood, but it was also claimed that he was a near relative and comrade on sea, and in the naval service, of two distinguished admirals of his own name, Colombo the Elder and Colombo the Younger, who were uncle and nephew. This claim is not without probable foundation, though Tarducci and other authors have thrown doubts upon parts of the story. Most authors, including Mr. Irving, give the account as authentic. That the two Admirals Colombo were active and bold leaders in the wars of the Mediterranean when Columbus was a young naval officer, and that he served gallantly under the banner of at least the Younger Colombo, and took part with him in a bloody encounter of the French fleet with the Venetian ships, is undoubted. Our admiral has himself, moreover, given authority to the claim of relationship with these noted admirals by a passage in one of his most famous letters—one which he addressed from the New World to a distinguished lady, the governess of the Infanta, Don Juan of Castile. "I am not the first admiral of my family," wrote Columbus; and then, as if despising all earthly pride and honor, and clinging only to his providential and divine mission, he likened himself unto David, and continued: "Let them give me what name they will for, in fine, David, the wise king, was a shepherd, and became King of Jerusalem, and I serve the same Lord who raised him to such high estate." These aspirations of the son and family of Columbus affect his position in history and before the world but little, since he won for himself, by his own genius and achievements, a patent of nobility and a rank in naval records higher and more glorious than the most famous admirals of naval history.

In 1470 Christopher Columbus commenced a career more pregnant of good to the world and of glory to himself than all the battles and victories which the historic waters of the Mediterranean could have ever witnessed, even in the days of classic Greece or imperial Rome. This was when he entered Portugal, and took up his residence at Lisbon, then the central and focal spot, where the science of navigation, the energy and thirst of adventure and discovery, the brilliant achievements of illustrious naval leaders, and the grand incentives to chivalrous and scientific deeds and service on the ocean culminated, and astonished the world. We have two accounts of the manner and motive of his going to Portugal. One represents him as having been engaged off the coast of that country in one of the most terrible and sanguinary battles of that warlike age, in which the hostile ships came together in

mortal encounter, were grappled and chained together, and the officers and crews met each other on the bloody decks in general struggle and in single combat, when suddenly a destructive fire swept across the struggling fleets, involving the combatants on both sides in dangers more terrific than human war. Columbus is said to have seized an oar, providentially cast in his way, and by its aid to have reached the shores of Portugal, and thence, assisted by public charity—such was now his poverty—travelled to the capital, awaiting the next turn in the wheel of fortune. If this be so, the hand of Providence threw in his way a ready passage from disaster and death to the initial approaches towards glory and immortality. Tarducci favors this account. At Lisbon he met many friends and congenial spirits, and among them his noble and devoted brother, Bartholomew.

But it seems to us more probable, and we believe, with Fernando Columbus, the admiral's son and historian, without discrediting the story of his shipwreck, that he was a voluntary seeker of this great rendezvous for navigators, cosmographers, seamen and leaders of the marine, scientists, geographers and discoverers. That he was drawn thither by the congenial air and sympathetic society of men, who, like himself, were bent on grand conceptions, useful explorations and practical discoveries. The Genoese boy, who, at the age of twelve and fourteen, had studied the great cosmographical authors, and had turned his talent for drawing to the delineations of the earth, could not have spent twenty years in active maritime service among distinguished admirals, experienced navigators and veteran voyagers, without an observant appreciation of all he saw, a careful study of the sea which he loved so much, and an intense inquiry into the causes which for centuries had left the earth so unexplored and its known limits so restricted. The same causes, which had for some years attracted to Lisbon the aspiring and energetic men of the maritime professions, most naturally operated on the mind and heart of the most intelligent, the most logical, the most profound and the bravest of them all. What other centre was there of maritime energy and enterprise than Lisbon for the future discoverer of the New World to make his headquarters? This very question, as to the motives which impelled the steps of Columbus towards Lisbon, assuming, as we now do, that it was the desire of maritime adventure, development and discovery, and the congenial pursuits of its court, king and people, makes this the proper point for the consideration of another more interesting and pregnant question—one of paramount attraction and fascination—When did the great admiral first conceive the thought, the inspiration, the providential mission, that there was another and unknown world, and that he was the chosen instrument of heaven for its discovery?

This question is involved in great obscurity, owing to, first, the active and engrossing life which Columbus led from the age of fourteen to the age of thirty-four, when he entered Portugal, and the consequent absence of any correspondence or record of his thoughts, studies or plans; and, second, the comparatively obscure and modest life he led in Lisbon up to the time of his public announcement of his proposals. It is certain that Columbus had his convictions, theories and proposals all brought to completion and formal arrangement by the year 1474, as we shall see hereafter from his correspondence with the celebrated cosmographer of Florence, Dr. Toscanelli. But how much sooner?

He arrived in Lisbon in 1470 (Mr. Winsor makes it 1473), and soon thereafter, either in that year or in 1471, he must have lived in Porto Santo, and there are rumors and charges of his having learned from an old pilot of the existence of land in the western ocean during his residence there. It was frequently reported, and even charged, that he knew the secret, and kept it as such for some time before he communicated it to Dr. Toscanelli or the King of Portugal. While the specific accusation has been proved to be unfounded, its existence is proof of a belief that he then knew the theory and fact. Mr. Irving proves that the whole thought originated exclusively in his own mind, and such assuredly was the case. But under any circumstances, so vast and profound a study and discovery, such an intricate and complicated system of reasonings, so much knowledge, observation, experience and research, such vast reading and study of voluminous works, such a fixed and definite view and conviction, such elaborate preparation, such vastness of detail and proof, such a well-arranged, studied and elaborated series of scientific and practical propositions, could never have been the fruits of a few years, but must have been the results of a lifetime of laborious application. At the age of fourteen he had studied cosmography and kindred sciences, and as the gifted youth looked out from the mountains encircling his native Genoa, his gaze rested on the sea, and through this highway or channel he could but see the only means of solving the many cosmographical questions discussed in the books he read. It is not probable, or even possible, that his earliest thoughts reached so far as a theory of the existence of western lands; but the germ was laid in his early boyhood, and his mind rested not until the germ had burst forth and borne fruit in an early period of his life. From the moment of this conviction in his youthful mind his life's leisure and his early and late hours were devoted to study and the discovery and collection of proofs and authorities to sustain his convictions. While it is not in our power to fix the date when his grand conception took defi-

nite shape in his mind, he himself assures us, and thus proves from his own words, that it was from his earliest years; for in the letter which he addressed to the Spanish sovereigns, accompanying his book of prophecies, as Tarducci states, and as we have already quoted, "He freely asserted his conviction that he had been chosen by God, *from his earliest years*, to carry out these two great undertakings—the discovery of the New World and the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre." Thus *from his earliest years* the trend of his mind, study and convictions must have been in this channel, and must have resulted in an early decision.

Columbus, on his arrival at Lisbon, was in the prime of life, and was a noble type of manhood. He is described as of a tall stature, powerfully built and admirably proportioned, and was graceful, dignified and noble in his carriage and bearing. His face was somewhat oval, long, but not fat or thin, complexion bright and tending towards ruddy, his face receiving animation from numerous freckles; his nose was aquiline, eyes bright, and his jaws were slightly projecting. In his diet he was frugal, and in his dress plain, though exceedingly neat. While his manner was affable in conversation with strangers and mild with servants, he was naturally grave. His natural disposition was subject to anger, but this imperfection he had overcome by spiritual discipline and a strong will. He was ever charitable and just in his comments on others. But it was his religious character and practices, at this time in particular, and during his whole life, which especially challenges our admiration. He spent much time in prayer, observed the most rigid fasts, attended the holy Mass every day, and recited daily the whole canonical office of a religious. He began nothing in life without first devoutly saying the pious prayer we have already mentioned, *Jesu cum Maria Sit nobis in Via*. He was a devout client of the Blessed Virgin, and a great admirer and imitator of St. Francis of Assisium. The Franciscans, in turn, were his especial friends in life and in death. That a man should have preserved his purity of life and so pious and religious a character through twenty years of a seafaring life, amid such scenes of strife, and in the companionship of turbulent and often unscrupulous adventurers and leaders, is the strongest proof that Columbus was a vessel of election, a representative of the Most High, a man blending at once the character of the patriarch, the apostle, the missionary, the ambassador of the faith and the chosen one of Providence.

Columbus was a daily and devout attendant at holy Mass, and at Lisbon he was present every day most piously at the holy sacrifice offered in the Convent-Church of All Saints. Among the pious ladies attending the convent schools was one of his own race, Felipa Moñis de Perestrella, of Italian descent, and of a family dis-

tinguished in the maritime history of Portugal. Her father had been one of the earliest followers of Prince Henry the Navigator, and had achieved early discoveries in that service; and at his death, owing to the destructive plague of the rabbits in the island of Porto Santo, he had become impoverished; his fame and an unsullied honor were all he left to his family, with the exception of a small share or remnant of property on that island. The future discoverer made the acquaintance of Felipa, their association ripened into friendship, finally into a mutual attachment, and they were married. From the time of his arrival at Lisbon he supported himself by making geographical maps, an art he commenced to practice when a boy at Genoa. Now his mother-in-law became a member of his household at Lisbon, and at Porto Santo, where he soon after went to reside. Here his son and successor, Diego, was born, and here he continued the occupation of map making. So accomplished was he in this art that it proved sufficiently lucrative to enable him to support his family, and assist his aged father at Genoa, a filial duty he always performed with generosity, even in the most impoverished periods of his life. His studies of navigation, and the absorption of his thoughts in the great problem of the earth, must have led ultimately to his neglecting his maps and his charts, and to his consequent pecuniary embarrassment. We do not know when he became a widower. In the midst of his own poverty we find that he visited his venerable parents in 1472 and 1473, and always assisted them; and continued his visits until he became engaged in his voyages to the New World. It was about this time that he must have conversed with King Alfonso V., of Portugal on his magnificent projects, and it is argued from his visits to court and the free converse of the king with him, that he had emerged from his obscurity, and had won repute as a man of science, especially learned in cosmography and navigation. In one of his visits to the king, the latter showed to him some reeds of immense size, which had been cast upon the shores of the Azores by the waters of the Atlantic. This fact was afterwards referred to by the Admiral as evidence of the existence of land across the western ocean. Columbus was now surely in possession of his great theory; a theory, which at an early period, assumed the shape of assumed conviction.

The Portuguese had now become the foremost nation in maritime adventure, energy and enterprise, had undertaken with enlightened and brilliant policy and ability, the solution of the great problem of reaching Asia by sea, had selected for that achievement the route on the Atlantic Ocean southward along the coast of Africa, then south-eastwardly and turning the Cape of Good Hope, eastwardly to the empires of the Grand Khan, teeming with

millions of subjects, enriched with gold and spices and precious stones and the richest fabrics of an oriental overland commerce. Now they had achieved a substantial and honorable progress in approaching the golden land of Ophir, and the dazzling riches and uncounted millions of the vast empires of the East. From the remotest antiquity Africa had been an enigma to philosophers, scientists, navigators and cosmographers.

It was the dark Continent, whose eastern, western and southern boundaries were almost as unknown as its vast interior. All was mystery concerning the land of the burning sun, and the man of color; Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Venetians, Genoese, the French, had essayed the solution of the problem. Centuries had been vainly spent in these brave and costly attempts to explore a Continent. For forty years the Portuguese had become the pioneers in this long and then fruitless effort, and, under the leadership of Prince Henry the navigator, third son of King John I., of Portugal, and Grand Master of the Order of Christ, had triumphantly carried the Portuguese flag to the south as far as Cape Non and beyond it then to Cape Bojador and beyond even that. The Madeira Islands and the Cape Verde Islands had now become familiar to mariners. The discovery of Porto Santo by Pere-strella, the father-in-law of Columbus, was like a new discovery of an old island; Portuguese colonies studded the islands of the Atlantic along the coast of Africa, and in 1442, Gileanez, a Portuguese captain, reached Cape da Gallee, 170 miles beyond Cape Bojador, and from the gold dust found called the place Rio d'Oro. Some of the most powerful princes of Africa had entered into treaties of friendship and commerce with the Portuguese. A gold mine discovered in Guinea was so promising in its anticipated yield of the precious metal that it received the distinguishing name of simply *The Mine*. Portugal, its court and its people were excited and most joyful over the brilliant achievements in African discovery, colonization and commerce. Lisbon, where Columbus now spent most of his time, was the central point of this zeal, energy and ambition for African expeditions; conversation at court, in the market-places, the homes and streets of the city, at the meetings of the navigators and adventurers, and of all classes, the voyages in the Atlantic and along the African coast constituted the whole exciting topic of conversation and discussion. Expeditions returning from successful discoveries, or departing on voyages of brilliant expectations, aroused each time the public excitement to the greatest point. The discovery of the Madeira and Azores Islands seemed to have given rise to the most extravagant tales of vast islands lying farther out at sea and not yet discovered, though dimly seen or ineffectually approached in the imagination

of ever hopeful and excitable sailors. The constant reports of the discovery of new kingdoms on the African coast, and of new islands in the Atlantic on the African route to Asia, fired the imaginations, stimulated the adventures, nerved the energies, and inflamed the fancies of the varied, commingling, diversified and scientific groups of aspiring people attracted together from every quarter of Europe at Lisbon. Commotion and excitement constituted the staple resources of this strange city. Delusions, seeking mythical islands, cities and empires, and the imaginations of overwrought adventurers, filled the Atlantic with phantom islands and lands. The Egyptian narrative of once powerful and vast Atlantis, now submerged by direst cataclysm, was revived. Aristotle's Antilla was again called up from the abyss to the possible horizon of the ocean. The tradition of the *Island of the Seven Cities*, over each of which presided a bishop, and where many an adventurous Portuguese pilot was alleged to have visited and was detained for fear that he might communicate to Spain the existence of the island, was now again repeated with every assurance of its verity. The famous Island of St. Brandan came forth to view, and its mountains and forests had been often and distinctly seen by the inhabitants of the Canaries, and so vividly presented to Prince Henry the Navigator, that several expeditions were sent out to discover and locate it, and the failure of each did not deter others from following the same delusive method; a method not based upon scientific data as were the subsequent triumphant voyages of Christopher Columbus. But in the Portuguese rage for maritime expeditions and new territorial discoveries there was much that was practical blended with the chimerical, much that resulted in extending the known area of the earth, and increasing the domains of that kingdom. The glorious career of Prince Henry, the Navigator in seeking Asia by the southern route around Africa had a brilliant and successful result after the Prince's death, and after Columbus had discovered the New World in seeking Asia. For it was the Portuguese who finally succeeded by that route in reaching Asia. The atmosphere of naval and maritime energy and prowess, which Columbus breathed during his residence at Lisbon, had a vast influence on his intelligent and enthusiastic character and mind, and constituted a part of the schooling, which he received for his illustrious and providential work.

But another powerful element entered here; one which greatly harmonized with the devout character and apostolic mission of Columbus. While the rage for Atlantic adventure and discovery aroused other nations to exertion in the same direction, the Holy See was the most profound, earnest and beneficent participator in these significant movements, to which, however, by its divine and apos-

tolic commission, religion gave a higher and holier purpose and aim. With the two-fold object of promoting the extension of human knowledge of the earth and encouraging science, and still more of opening new fields for the spread of the Gospel, it bestowed every blessing and privilege upon them. In order to confirm the splendid work of Prince Henry and of the Crown of Portugal, the Holy See conferred upon Portugal the primatial right over all the barbarous countries the Portuguese might discover, from Cape Bojador to the *East Indies*. The Holy Father also threatened with spiritual deprivations and penalties all who should thwart these beneficent strides of a Christian nation into the realms of paganism, and a plenary indulgence was granted to all such as might join these now blessed expeditions and perish in promoting them in the manner pointed out by the papal conditions. These generous concessions imparted to these maritime expeditions, virtually, the character of a crusade, and the crown of martyrdom was offered to the self-sacrificed. Neither the aspirations of his boyhood, when looking longingly to the sea from his native Genoese hills, nor the scientific problems evolving in his ever-active mind, nor the robust naval campaigns of over twenty years, nor the conversations of veteran navigators, nor his own struggles to rise from poverty, nor his ambition, nor the correspondence of the learned, so impressed the devout and profound mind and soul of Columbus, all combined, as did the single blessing of the Church.

But there was another school, in which the preparation of Columbus for his sacred mission must have received immense development at this time. His wife's father was Bartholomew Moñis de Perestrella, an Italian gentleman naturalized in Portugal, a protégé of Prince Henry the Navigator, the discoverer and colonizer of the island of Porto Santo. The vastness of his landed estates on this island, the reluctance of the Portuguese for colonization, the sterility of the land, and the annihilating ravages of the swarms of rabbits, had ruined his fortunes, and though he left his family poor, there was to Columbus, besides the attractions of the young, beautiful, and pious wife, whose Italian descent also drew him again more closely to his native country, a mine of wealth and information in the maritime traditions of such a family, in the maps and charts which the deceased navigator had left behind him and which Columbus' mother-in-law took special pleasure in laying before his eager eyes, in the conversations with her, in which she repeated the animating stories her husband had related so often of the sea and of his voyages, and in the companionship of voyagers, navigators, seamen, and captains, who habitually resorted to the home of the family, and perpetuated by their sailor's yarns, and the stories and experiences of many an adventurous voyage,

the history of the past, while they contributed much to the making of future history. So much was this the case that it gave origin after the admiral's death, and as late as 1609, a century and a half after the discovery, to one of the most unjust assaults upon his well-earned fame, a libel upon his life and history, a malignant calumny upon his name and reputation. This unworthy invention is to the effect that while Columbus was living at Terceira, one of the Azores, with his wife, mother, and little son, Diego Columbus, who had been born to him at Porto Santo, he received with hospitality into his humble home five shipwrecked mariners, driven by western Atlantic storms upon that island, these five being the remnants of a crew of seventeen; the rest were lost at sea. That of these five seamen, four died in the house of Columbus, one after another, from the injuries of their shipwreck, that the last survivor was named Alonzo Sanchez, of Huelva in Spain, and that after imparting to Columbus his invaluable secret, he too expired in the arms of the future admiral. The pretended secret of the shipwrecked sailors was that they had sailed from the Canaries for Madeira, and were overtaken by furious storms and forced across the Atlantic to an unknown land, whose latitude they took and whose description they committed to writing, and that on their return they were again overwhelmed with storms, lost all of their number except five, and these were tossed, scarcely alive on the shores of Terceira, that the expiring Sanchez imparted the secret to Columbus, and that the land they thus discovered was the same that was afterwards called Hispaniola by Columbus. It was a part of the libel that Columbus kept this secret and used it as his guide in discovering America. This calumny was so utterly without foundation, so diametrically contradicted by known and undisputed facts, so entirely at variance with the independent, upright, truthful, frank, and honorable character of Columbus, and has been so triumphantly refuted by arguments drawn from history, reason, and authority, that now no one is so reckless as to repeat it. It has served, however, the only purpose of showing how, not only his public associations, but also his private relations, concurred in pointing to Columbus as the discoverer of the New World and in preparing him for the work.

Columbus was thirty-three years old when he was transferred from active, robust, and stirring service on the sea, the school in which he learned so completely the sciences of practical seamanship and navigation, to the more scientific, comprehensive, and cosmographical theatre of geographical adventure and discovery, of national and economic colonization, of statesmanlike expansion, of political progress, and of national aggrandizement. To him it was a school of personal culture, of profound scientific investiga-

tion, of domestic virtues and affections thus developed, from those of a model son to those even more tender ones of husband and father; it was a school of the novitiate for the apostolic vocation of the lay missionary, of the most chivalrous loyalty to the Holy See and the Church, and above all to religion, of Christian self-denial, the correction of a naturally angry disposition and the acquisition of personal and graceful virtues, of the most profound and ascetic type outside of the cloister; a school of divine and earthly wisdom, in which he acquired that ability for affairs the most intricate and difficult, which Washington Irving and historians generally recognize as enabling him afterwards in the drama of discovered worlds to bear himself with consummate action. It was a school in which he studied alike the applied sciences, the geography of the known earth, and penetrated with majestic genius the yet unknown. Here he studied the Sacred Scriptures, and pondered over the prophesies; and here the fathers of the Church, the doctors of the schools, the mystic theology of the Middle Ages, the history of the crusades, the splendid career of the Church, the works of Christian civilization, became familiar to his studious and gifted mind. He assimilated them all, morally and intellectually. He spent seven years at Lisbon, apparently fruitless years so far as active and historic results reveal themselves, but they were the years of his august preparation; years during which his great problem developed to perfection. Tarducci says that "Christopher Columbus was one of the best geographers and cosmographers of the age, and was accustomed to the sea from his infancy; and coming at this time to Portugal he found himself in his natural element, and his delight is easily imagined." Count Roselly de Lorgues speaks of his arrival in Lisbon as miraculous; of the development of his genius; the expansion of his comparative faculties; his holding constant communication with the learned and the great of earth; the completion of his physical vigor and intellectual endowments, the noble largeness of his forehead, now fully developed, indicated thought. It is here his history commences; he associated with kings by the sheer force of his learning and genius, and the potentiality of his vast services to the State. Even his home at Porto Santo during a part of those seven years was a school to the studious discoverer, for here he examined the whole of the progress of the Portuguese discoverers along the coast of Guinea, and the route they followed. "Here," says the Count de Lorgues, "surrounded by the immensity of the ocean—an image of the Infinite—under the dazzling light of a tropical sun, the genius of Columbus matured in the depths of his thoughts a super-human idea—a project bolder than that of any known heroism. What he had seen, what he had heard, served only to corroborate

rate the justice of his inductions. His habits, his tastes, his family connections seemed to be prearranged for the furtherance of the plan, which was elaborated in the depths of his reflections."

In an age of maritime excitement and self-delusion, the genius of Columbus, acting upon scientific data, distinguished the illusive from the real, rejected the phantom islands and lands of heated imaginations, and stood steadily to the true scientific theory, which he alone among men had discovered and was ready to apply. Mr. Irving says: "The construction of a correct map or chart in those days, required a degree of knowledge and experience sufficient to entitle the possessor to distinction," and speaks of the knowledge, skill, and superior correctness of Columbus as a cosmographer, as winning "for him notoriety among men of science." "His geographical labors elevated him to a communion with the learned." "He was led to know how much of the world remained unknown, and to meditate on the means of exploring it." "The enthusiastic nature of his conceptions gave an elevation to his spirit and a dignity and loftiness to his whole demeanor." "His views were princely and unbounded." Such are the sentiments of Washington Irving on the genius and character of Columbus.

Many more historians could be quoted who have paid exalted tributes to the character of Columbus, had we time to quote from them. Time and space will permit but one additional quotation. The English Jesuit, Father Arthur George Knight, thus speaks of him: "Columbus was certainly a man of prompt action and ready wit, keenly conscious of all that was passing around him, self-possessed in danger and fertile in resources; but he was not the less on that account a great reader, a great student, and a dreamer of splendid dreams. He was acquainted with all the cosmographical learning of the time, and well versed in all the books which were then regarded as oracular in their assertions about the confines of the habitable globe. He had pored over the glowing pages of Marco Polo till the magnificent vision of Cipango and Cathay (founded upon the actual wonders of China and Japan) had fastened upon his soul, and he never doubted that the Grand Khan was such as he had been depicted, and only waited the summons of the Catholic sovereigns, to be baptized with all his people." "Few men indeed, perhaps only Saints, have escaped like Columbus with unwounded conscience from such turbulent scenes." "He had strongly grasped the fundamental truth that the actions of men have their meaning and value from reference to the life of God Incarnate." "The grand idea which filled the mind and claimed the whole soul of Columbus was to make a highway round the earth, and bring the nations in willing homage to the

feet of Jesus Christ, reigning once more in Jerusalem of the Christians."

Little now is needed to complete the delineation of the man, who, feeling his providential mission revealed within him, resolutely bent all his energies for many years to a thorough preparation for his great mission. A few more words will suffice. The rich graces which abounded in his soul from the inexhaustible religious fountains to which he constantly resorted, embraced among them a pious humility which was not ostentatiously practiced, but gently found expression in an innate self-control and outward modesty of appearance, dress, manners and habits. It was this that added such rare grace to his majestic stature and carriage, and elegantly harmonized with his dignified and manly character. So intense had been his studies of all the sciences connected with the great problem he was to solve, and such his checkered life, that his hair, which was naturally blonde inclining to chestnut, was turning gray at the age of thirty-three. His gestures were natural, easy, graceful and impressive, and he was an orator, when need be, of no mediocre power and eloquence. His intellect seemed to rejoice in the strength, proportions and perfections of his perfect physique. His senses were acute to a fine degree; he possessed a rare fineness of hearing, cultured by his constant out-door life and the habit and the necessity of meeting dangers of every kind. His keenness of sight served him in many a dire crisis, and enabled him to discern the most minute differences of colors and classify the finest tints, and to measure distances when he was in search of worlds. His delicacy of taste was equally remarkable, and by it he could trace differences and detect qualities inappreciable to men generally. His delicacy of smell surpassed all these, and with his perfection of other senses enabled him to value and admire more than other men the beautiful works of the Creator, so that he found in the book of nature endless sources of infinite delight and profound study; his knowledge and appreciation of the habits and qualities of flowers, birds, sea products, spices, perfumes, waters, waves, general vegetation, winds, clouds, fishes, and in fact of every object in nature, were manifested constantly, and especially during his first and succeeding voyages to the New World. His sense of touch was like an armor to one who, *levant and couchant*, was exposed to so many dangers. While his clothing was rigidly plain, it was exquisitely clean and white, neat and appropriate. His horsemanship was perfect. He was a valiant knight—a veritable Bayard, without fear or reproach; a crusader; a soldier on land, a mariner on the water—at once a general and an admiral.

Columbus was free from vices of every kind, and his long

contact with rude and vicious people on the seas had never impaired his morals; swearing and profane songs sickened him; he abstained from wine and the delicacies of the table, refrained from games of chance and all effeminate luxuries, restricting himself almost to a vegetable diet. His habits of order and punctuality were exact, and he seemed always to strive to accomplish the best and most perfect thing of which the situation was capable. He was affectionate and tender to his relatives and friends, kind and gentle to inferiors, and to his enemies and criminals he was forbearing and forgiving. To his parents he was the most loyal of sons. He was munificent, and his liberality was co-extensive with the vast realms he discovered, and excelled even the vice-regal revenues to which he was at once entitled, and of which he was unjustly deprived. He was public-spirited, enterprising and unconventional, fruitful in resources and ever prepared for emergencies. He was eloquent, graceful, graphic, yet natural. He was imaginative and poetic, giving vent, in his later years, to his feelings in verse, and his thoughts expressed assumed an epic and massive grandeur. Whether on land or sea, he was devout, religious, chaste, and regular in his devotions and pious practices. No surroundings, however degraded or vicious, could impair his character. His worship of the Creator in his works, whether on land or sea, was like a perpetual renewal of that sublime anthem, *A solis ortu usque ad occasum, laudabile nomen Domini!* His natural and acquired gifts, whether of body, or mind, or heart or soul, would have pointed him out under more favorable circumstances as the future discoverer of the New World. As it was, he could not pass without notice, though observers never penetrated the cause. These gifts, viewed with his assured, and oft asserted claim to a divine mission, toward the accomplishment of which his every aspiration tended until his final accomplishment of the greatest of human deeds, show that with him preparation was equal to destiny, readiness was equal to promise, and finally, accomplishment was equal to prophesy.

The subject of Christopher Columbus will be continued in the issues of April, July and October, with the second, third and fourth progressive articles: Second, for April, The Prophesy—The Offer—The Acceptance. Third, for July, The Accomplishment. Fourth, for October, Ingratitude, Misfortunes, Posthumous Honors. The series will contain every leading fact of his history, will interpret his remarkable and profound character, vindicate his memory from unjust calumnies, maintain his proper place in the annals of our race, and present him to the cordial, generous and patriotic admiration, gratitude and honor of our country.

RICHARD H. CLARKE, LL.D.

AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

I.—AN OBJECTION AGAINST THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPE.

SOME time ago the *Catholic World* published an important article on the "temporal sovereignty of the Pope," from the pen of one, to whom we can apply a well known phrase: "*cuius laus est in universa Americæ ecclesia.*"¹ A distinguished Catholic priest in his remarks on this article, incidentally called attention to an objection "which rises naturally in the minds of republican Catholics." He formulates this objection in the following words:

"There is no use trying to enlighten the Catholic laity, unless you place in the clearest light the consistency between the right of the Pope to independence and the right of the people to self-government. That the Pope ought to be free to treat with all the nations of the earth, of course, all admit, but how his temporal sovereignty consists with republican principles is the question to be treated in an article addressed to the people of these United States; and Catholic writers should devote their energies to making clear this aspect of the great and important subject. We Catholics live in the midst of fifty-five millions of people estranged from the Church, and holding theoretically, at least, this latter principle; we cleave to it ourselves as well; in order, therefore, that we may give to the Pope 'reasonable service' in this matter, and give also to our fellow citizens 'a reason for the faith that is in us,' and answer their demand—'why we meddle with the affairs of Italy?'—we must have more on the subject."

We entirely agree with this conclusion and express our conviction in the following words: We are sincere Catholics and sincere patriots. A theoretical or practical consequence of Catholic doctrine can never conflict with true patriotism. Contradictions can therefore only be apparent; they are either inexact and grounded on a defective knowledge of Catholic teaching, or not to the point.

The appropriateness of treating the question is therefore manifest.² Another consideration will prove its opportuneness and necessity.

The Pope, according to Catholic doctrine, is not only the infal-

¹ Very Reverend A. J. Hewit, *Catholic World*, December, 1890.

² We may be allowed to mention that, before the above lines came to our notice, we referred to the difficulty and answered it substantially, in an article in which we openly defended the application of the principles of self-government to France. See AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1891, "Cardinal Lavigerie and the French Republic," p. 120, note.

lible teacher, but also the supreme ruler of the Church. A Catholic owes *assensum fidei* to his doctrinal definitions, and *plena obedientiam* to his orders and precepts. Complete obedience in both cases is the characteristic of a true Catholic.

“Summus autem est magister in Ecclesia Pontifex Romanus. Concordia igitur animorum sicut perfectum in una fide consensum requirit, ita voluntates postulat Ecclesiae Romanoque Pontifici perfecte subiectas atque obtemperantes, ut Deo. *Perfecta autem esse obedientia debet, quia ab ipsa fide praecepitur, et habet hoc commune cum fide, ut dividua esse non possit . . . cuiusmodi perfectionis tantum christiana consuetudo tribuit, ut illa tanquam nota internoscendi catholicos et habita semper sit et habeatur.*”—Encyclica “Sapientiae Christianae,” 1889.

The following facts are undeniable: First, the Pope himself does not cease advocating his claims to the Temporal Power. In the Encyclical “Inscrutabili,” 21st April, 1878, he says: “Never shall we abstain from claiming that freedom be again restored to the Holy See by the recovery of the temporal power.” Therefore, we renew all the declarations and protestations of our predecessor, Pius IX., of blessed memory. Again, “It is our sacred duty,” the holy Father says in an allocution to the College of Cardinals, March 2, 1880, “to preserve our right intact in spite of all opposition to the contrary, no matter whence it comes.” This alone is enough to convince a Catholic that the “concordia animorum” forbids silence on this question; more especially at this time when our Father in his distress and afflictions appeals to the hearts of his children for sympathy and redress.

Secondly, the Holy Father expressly calls upon the Catholics of the whole world to second his efforts in the defence of his rights and the restoration of his territorial independence, and thus prove themselves devoted and loyal Catholics. “The Catholics of the various States can never hold their peace until they see their Chief, the teacher of their faith, the guide of their consciences, again possessed of true liberty and really independent.” (Letter to the Secretary of State, Cardinal Nina, August 27, 1878.) Therefore the Holy Father doubts not “but that all Catholics all the world over will support, openly and unrestrained, these rights of the Holy See” (Allocution, June 1, 1888.) Frequently he directs this admonition to the Catholics of Italy itself (3d January, 1888.) With an affectionate tenderness he reminds Catholic writers and above all Catholic journalists of this duty: “Therefore, my beloved sons, cease not, both by word of mouth and in your writings, to contend that the temporal sovereignty of the Pope is necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual power.” (Address to Catholic journalists, February 22, 1879.)

II.—THE TRUE QUESTION.

We treat this question from the Catholic standpoint, as it is derived from that twofold obedience which characterizes a Catholic. Our non-Catholic fellow-citizens must likewise accept the same standpoint as the basis of their criticism. We need not prove to a Catholic that the Pope, by Divine disposition, has the right and the duty to rule the Church in perfect immunity and independence of any earthly power, and that, by the same Divine right, he is exempt from any secular jurisdiction whatsoever. He therefore is—as Leo XIII. expresses it—"by the express will of the Founder of the Church not subject to any secular power." (Letter to Cardinal Rampolla, 15th June, 1887.)

The right to this immunity is essential to the Papacy. The exercise of that right however, is not absolutely necessary to the existence of the Church (*ut Ecclesia sit*), but it is necessary for the perfect development of its social life (*ut bene sit*). Providence availed itself of the *Temporal Power* as a means to secure to the Popes the free and undisturbed development of their sublime prerogative.

In the early ages, triumphant and victorious, all through the many and bitter persecutions, the Church had the stamp of her Divine origin set upon her. Those years might be called the Church's infancy. The time came, however, when she was to put forth the full vigor of life. The freedom and independence of the Head of the Church was, by Divine Providence, to foster its steady growth, and thus it came to pass that the Popes acquired the temporal dominion over Rome, the seat of their Pontificate. (See letter to Cardinal Rampolla.) No unbiased, unprejudiced historian has ever called into question the legitimacy of this temporal dominion and that, too, considering only its historical origin. This, for us, is a settled question in our present discussion. Likewise, we need not prove that the Pope after the spoliation of his States, *i.e.*, since September 20, 1870, no longer enjoys that liberty and independence which the nature and dignity of his office demand. "*Verius in aliena potestate sumus quam nostra*," "We are more really in the power of another than our own." We might refer to two facts which will convince even the most ardent friend of Italian unity of the truth of these words of Leo XIII. The outrageous scandals of which Rome was the scene in the early part of October, 1891, when the city echoed the cry "*abasso il Papa*"; the infamous insult which was heaped upon the corpse of the great Pius amid the demon cries, "*al fiume*." These two events in the history of New Italy speak more than volumes.

In fine a Catholic cannot rejoin: "Let the Pope look for a free

abode elsewhere," for his faith tells him that to this day it is *only* as *Bishop of Rome* that the Popes succeed St. Peter and possess the plenitude of apostolic power. We may add that it is a theological truth drawn from the teaching of faith that the Primacy *iure divino* belongs, until the end of time, to the Bishop of Rome *alone*, and that it therefore cannot be transferred even by the Pope himself to another See. But suppose this last were possible, still we cannot find therein a solution of the difficulty; for elsewhere the same questions may arise. It therefore remains true that the Pope as *Bishop of Rome*, and according to the natural order of things—in Rome and from Rome—governs and directs the affairs of the Church of God unmolested, and that in Rome at least he must not be subject to any secular authority, that is, the Pope must also be the temporal ruler of Rome. In this sense Catholics in concert with the Pope declare the necessity of the Temporal Power. Catholics need not be told that this necessity cannot be made the subject of a *dogma*, since it is not a matter of revealed truth. Neither do we discuss the question whether it is a dogmatic fact and whether consequently, the supreme ecclesiastical authority *can* by an infallible definition make it *de fide ecclesiastica*. Nor do we inquire whether Pius IX. or Leo XIII. really did *define* the necessity of the Temporal Power. We are satisfied that all dutiful children of the Church, in obedience to the Holy Father ought faithfully to maintain the necessity of the Temporal Power—"firmissime retinere," as the *Syllabus* expresses it.¹ We are only concerned with the task of reconciling this duty of Catholics with certain principles of modern and particularly of American public right.

We divide the objection into two parts according to the two principles upon which it rests: *The people are sovereign*; and *salus publica suprema lex*: private interest must be subordinated to the public good!

We must first agree on the terms we shall use. The harmony between the right of the Pope to independence and the right of the people to self-government, does not mean that the Pope has a right to be the temporal ruler of Rome independently of the consent of the Roman people, and that at the same time the Roman people has actually a right to choose its own ruler!

Nor will we prove that the temporal power is in harmony with republican principles in this sense, that the Pope's right to monarchical government does not exclude the right of the Roman people to proclaim the republic!

¹ "Praeter hos errores explicite notatos alii complures implicite reprobantur proposita et asserta doctrina, quam catholici omnes firmissime retinere debent, de civili Romani Pontificis principatu."—See *Syllab.*, 76.

We will not strive to reconcile contradictions. The school of Fichte itself would find it difficult to do so; and surely no American principle demands it.

If two rights are contradictory, then one of them is no right, or, at least, one of them ceases to be a right, because of this contradiction.

Our task is to prove that we give "reasonable service" to our Church and to our country.

"Giving a reason" for our liberty of thought and conscience guaranteed by our Constitution, we shall prove that as philosophers we admit, *in abstracto*, not only "republican principle," but also in a true sense a "sovereignty of the people."

"Giving a reason" for our patriotism, we have only to prove that the Catholic view of the Roman question does not hinder us from being wholly and sincerely attached to our Constitution and from obeying the laws of our country. Freely "giving a reason for the faith that is in us," we shall prove that neither "republican principle" nor the "right of the people to self-government" have anything to do with the "right of the Pope to independence"; in a word, that this right does not fall under any such "principle."

The following words of Brownson are to the point: "Liberty is never to be understood as exemption from all restraints, nor from all restraints but those which are *self-imposed*, which are no restraints at all . . . there is a strong tendency, and, I hold, a dangerous tendency, among us . . . to extol and defer to the alleged wisdom and good sense of the mass. . . . The genuine people, if their voice could really be heard, would be loud and earnest in condemnation of this tendency. . . . In the name of science, of knowledge, of wisdom, of virtue, of the people, . . . I for one solemnly protest against this servility to the mass, a servility to which a man never submits in good faith nor for honest purposes. . . . Let us, then, cease our adulation of the mass, cease our insane efforts to adapt everything to the apprehension of the mass, to gauge the amount of truth we may tell by the amount the multitude can take in; and do our best to gain all truth, to nourish and invigorate ourselves for wisely-directed and long-continued efforts for the elevation of all men."¹

¹ Works of O. Brownson, vol. xv., p. 299, *segg.* A careful study of the articles, "Origin and Ground of Government," "Demagogueism," "National Greatness," would answer the objection we are considering.

We use the words "self-government" and "sovereignty of the people," although they cannot be strictly taken in their literal meaning. Their true sense will be made clear as we proceed. Let us also note that "republican principle" and the "right of self-government" are very different things; the one does not imply the other.

III.—INDIRECT ANSWER.

We will add one remark which contains an answer to the difficulty, though it does not give a real *solution*. No Catholic has a right to make his obedience to the Pope subservient to his own scientific views, political theories, or local national desires. His obedience should be “perfect,” “undivided,” “absolute,” not a “*suum lacrum obedientie*” which destroys the “*natura obedientie*,” as Leo XIII. remarks in the same encyclical. In our religious duties we are not to look up to Nationalism as our guide but to the Church. As a matter of fact we know full well that the faithful performance of our duties as citizens of the United States does not bring us into conflict with any doctrinal or moral teaching of the Catholic religion. As Catholics, and precisely because we are Catholics, we should not allow any one to surpass us in that respect. But the objection supposes the opposite. This will explain our categorical answer.

If every nation of the world asserted its national standpoint as a *conditio sine qua non* of its obedience to the Pope, what would be the result? Have they not all the same right to hold dear their national traditions, customs and regulations as we Americans? The Church, like a loving and just mother, always respects national peculiarities and all just claims founded on them. In this, the Church gives us an example worthy of imitation. But just as she unites all in the unity of faith, she also desires all to be one in obedience to her visible head. *Ecclesia nationum, non vero nationalis!* this is the apostolic motto of the Catholic Church; this is one of the notes characterizing her as the one true Church.

IV.—DIRECT ANSWER.

A—The Sovereignty of the People.

Now let us attempt a complete solution. Our opponents say: “We have positive reasons to reserve our judgment on the Roman question. For, as Americans, we recognize the principle of popular sovereignty; it is the ground-work of the Constitution of the United States, the support of our public and political life. But now, did not the Italian, or at least the Roman people desire the fall of the temporal power of the Pope? Is it not a contradiction, then, for us to extol the sovereign will of the people of this country and at the same time to approve of the restoration of the territorial independence of the Pope? Is that not virtually to deny the sovereignty of another people?”

We ask, has popular sovereignty any place in the *Church*? The answer of Catholic doctrine is *No*. To enter deeply into a confirmation of this answer here would be out of place, but a concise

explanation is necessary to illustrate the religious aspect of our question.

The Church is an institution essentially supernatural, to which all men, by the decree of God, must look for salvation. The Incarnate Son of God founded it immediately and in His own person, and gave it that authority which was to bring about that happy and blessed union here below, whose highest ideal and antetype is in heaven, "that they all may be one as Thou, Father, in me and I in Thee." But more than this, the Divine Founder of the Church not only defined the spiritual power His Church was to exercise for that end, but he also designated in particular *who* were to exercise it. Upon St. Peter and his successors He bestowed the plenitude of pastoral power; to the successors of the other Apostles, the bishops, He entrusted the direction of particular churches "in which the Holy Ghost had placed them." Every Pope receives immediately from Christ the entire Apostolic authority with which Peter, the first Pope, was endowed. This authority is, therefore, neither in its origin nor in its exercise, dependent on the approbation of the Church, the bishops, the priests, or the laity. The Episcopacy, no less than the Papacy, is of divine institution; it is an essential institution of the Church. Nevertheless it remains true, that only *One* rules the *whole* Church, that only *One* possesses the fulness of power; that all others are subject to Him; that He can judge all, but cannot be judged by any one; that He is the centre of unity about which all must gather to be partakers of the Kingdom of God.

The constitution of the Church is, therefore, truly monarchical, though tempered to a certain extent with the aristocracy of the divinely instituted Episcopacy, but not mixed with it. The rest of the faithful are the *ecclesia discens*. The authority of the Church does not proceed from them, nor does it depend on them, either immediately or mediately. Still, all the offices of the Church, the highest included, are within the reach of the humblest of its members. In this sense, and only in this sense, can we speak of a democratic element in the constitution of the Church.

Efforts to introduce the principle of popular sovereignty into the Church have not been wanting. The court theologian of Louis, the Bavarian, Marsilius Patavinus, inaugurated the movement in the thirteenth century. He claimed that, according to the will of Christ, all ecclesiastical power is vested in the people. Gerson and Peter D'Ailly enunciated similar principles during the Great Schism of the West. The apostate, de Dominis, sought to spread them in the seventeenth century. From his works, the Gallicans, especially Richter, drew their arguments; Jansenism, Febronianism, Josephism, had recourse to the same theological arsenal for their weapons.

At the time of the Vatican Council, Döllinger renewed this theory, inasmuch as he claimed that the bishops at the Council are only mandatories of the people. The clear decisions of this Council dealt the death-blow to all these attempts. If, in spite of this, Catholics dare to assert, or write, that "the Church desires a non-Italian Pope, who will grant the people a greater share in the government of the Church," we can only say, that such an assertion is the untheological offspring of a narrow-minded nationalism.

Protestantism, to be consistent with its denial of the ecclesiastical principle of authority, was forced to place all ecclesiastical power in the hands of the people. It rejected the divine origin of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and transferred all power to the various "congregations" (*gemeinde*), and degraded the "ministers of the word" to mere representatives of the people. Secular princes, whose aid could not be dispensed with, were made the highest representatives of the community. This was practically to convert the sovereignty of the people with regard to ecclesiastical matters into *Cæsaro-papism*.

II.—POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY AS A POLITICAL PRINCIPLE.

We have now to consider the sovereignty of the people from a political, and especially from an American standpoint. *Is it a general principle? Is it an American principle? And in what sense?*

Popular sovereignty can be understood to mean that the *ultimate reason* and *original source* of all authority is the common consent of all—the will of the people, and not God, of whom all paternity, all authority, is called in heaven and on earth. This principle is totally false; or rather, no principle at all. Precisely in this sense did Hobbes and Rousseau, the founders of this modern theory, put forth their doctrine; each one adding a shade of coloring of his own. Their set purpose, in asserting the sovereignty of the people, was to separate and estrange society from any and every relation to a personal God—to establish the "State without God." Though it does not always openly avow it, Liberalism employs this principle in the sense of the "contrat social," and this for a like purpose. Popular sovereignty renders it an immense service; for it is a fruitful source whence are derived the means of furthering its plans, and legalizing State-absolutism. We are not to regard the sovereign power of the people in this atheistic-materialistic sense.

Anarchists and Socialists openly declare that the sovereignty of the people is to be understood in that sense, and that they intend to carry out their plans on that principle as soon as they have a majority in the Houses of Legislation.

The cynical saying of Bebel, "Ja gäbe es einen Gott, dann wären

wir geleimt"—"If there were a God, we would be caught in a trap"—leaves no room for conjecture on that head.

In Rousseau's system, accordingly, the source of all right is the people, *i.e.*, the majority of those who call themselves the people's representatives, or the "State," the government of which is determined by the "people." In their political enactments, this sovereign people recognize no divine or natural law—no inborn or acquired right. Whatever is legal is, according to this theory, allowable and good. Every change of government, every revolution, is, *ipso facto*, justifiable as soon as it is accomplished by the people, or in the name of the people. *Quod populo placuit legis habet vigorem*—"The will of the people has the force of law" in any and under all circumstances. Shall we, can we, as Christians, and as citizens, defend our position on any political question with this notion of popular sovereignty? No; never. That would mean, in other words: To be a good American citizen, one must tread under foot, at least theoretically, the rights of God and man; or, the American citizen, as such, is a revolutionist against any and every authority above his own! In the name of all that we hold sacred in our religion, in the name of our patriotism, we decline to defend our position on the Roman question, or on any other political or politico-religious question, against the representatives of that "principle," whether they call themselves Socialists or not. We can come to no understanding with materialism, or make any concessions to it. We are a Christian people. We despise a Robespierre who, in the name of the people, wished to do away with the existence of God by an enactment of the State; we have just as little in common with modern political deists, who are striving to place Almighty God on the retired list with a pension.

On political events, then, such as the overthrow of an existing government, we pass judgment according to the divine and natural law; according to the eternal principles of justice which worldly power may thrust aside and despise, but which it can never subvert or destroy. Our question can, therefore, only be the following:

Is it not a principle of natural right, that God, the fountain-head of all authority, has placed political authority in the hands of the people, from whom all government, whether monarchical or democratic, directly derives its authority?

You have full right to hold this doctrine, and we do not oppose it ourselves. Most of the Christian philosophers and theologians were formerly, and still are, of the opinion that the *consensus populi* is the proximate cause of civil society, and that the civil power, considered in particular persons, comes only mediately from God, but immediately from the people. But it cannot be put

down as an unquestionable philosophical principle of the natural law. It is, at most, but an opinion, even though it be a very probable one. There are many acknowledged authorities who do not even recognize the sovereignty of the people to be a principle in that sense, but defend the opinion that the will of the people only designates the bearer of public authority, while God himself confers on him immediately the power to rule. It would be preposterous to deny this fact, and not at all courteous to assert that the defenders of this last opinion have no good reason for it, and that the opposite must be perfectly obvious, must be, *prima facie*, evident to all.¹ Moreover, it is well to remark that those who hold to the more democratic opinion do not allow the people the right to overthrow and rid themselves of a lawfully constituted government which has lost favor in its eyes upon the plea of popular sovereignty. This would be to sanction revolution indiscriminately, as Rousseau has done. They likewise admit that there may be other legitimate titles to the exercise of supreme civil authority, as there have been at all times and are to this day.

As Catholics, we are entirely free to embrace either one of these two opinions. The Church has defined nothing in this matter. She has been content, at all times, to confront revolutionary machinations with the Apostolic doctrine (on that account none the less evident to reason), that God, the author of nature, created man a social being, and therefore willed that authority, without which a well-ordered society of free agents cannot be conceived. Therefore, all civil authority is mediately from God. In very truth, then, do the bearers of it reign "by the Grace of God."

Now suppose a people determines to adopt a constitution, then most assuredly, it can without any detriment to the natural law, choose a democratic as well as a monarchical form of government. It can positively declare, through its representatives, that in the government about to be established the supreme authority, divinely ordained, actually proceeds from the people; and that their representatives are only to exercise it as their delegates. In such a State or society the theory of popular sovereignty has the effect of a fundamental law, by which every loyal citizen must abide; which he is to look to for the preservation of his civil and political rights, and which accordingly must guide him in the performance

¹ See the authors for both opinions in the works of Costa-Rossetti, S. J., who strenuously defends the first opinion: *Philosophia Moralis*, p. 593, seqq.; *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 1888-90; *Die Staatslehre der Christlichen Philosophie*. S. Thomas treats this question, q. 2, 9, 10, a. 10; q. 12, a. 2; I, 2, q. 105, a. 1; q. 90, a. 3; q. 92, a. 3; ad. 3. One of the most ardent and profound advocates of the rights of the people is Suarez, *Defensio fidei*, I, 3, c. 2; *De legibus*, I, 3, c. 4. See also Brownson's *Origin and Ground of Government*.

of his duties. Thereupon the representatives of the people may declare: "We accept the democratic theory as the principle of the government under which we are going to live." A Parliament with a thousand members could not do more than this. It is beyond its competency to change a question of natural and public right into a general principle which shall be universally binding. And, if in our day the theory of popular sovereignty has been recognized in most States, and has passed into current public right, it is significant of nothing but that modern governments have accepted it as the ground-work of their constitution. This is precisely the case in our glorious Republic. With us the sovereignty of the people is at the bottom of all public right. Indeed, nowhere do we see it exercised so liberally. But the framers of our Constitution, who were by no means hostile to the interests of religion, did not dream of approving the theory of popular sovereignty in the atheistical sense of a Rousseau. Just as little did they wish to decide the abstract question about the origin of civil authority. Considering the peculiar condition in which our people lived, they simply looked upon a Constitution founded on the sovereign will of the people as the best for our country.

From what has been said we draw a two-fold conclusion: In the first place, that we as citizens of the United States, have an indisputable right to hold popular sovereignty in the highest esteem; to proclaim aloud that it is the best system of government for the American people, because it accords best with our character and the traditions of our country. But, it would be most ridiculous, and this is the other conclusion, were we to maintain that we had thereby established a principle which should be binding for all times and be accepted by all nations. With precisely the same right, may another system be adopted elsewhere, which may equally well meet the desires, and may be practically as well adapted to the necessities of that country as our system is for us. Did we attempt to impose our political views on other peoples, whose character and wants may be totally unlike ours, we would be untrue to our American sense of liberty. No, a true American is proof against the madness of Chauvinism. God forbid that such a foreigner should ever be naturalized here.

Deductions.—What we have hitherto said, we think, warrants the following conclusions:

There is no sovereignty of the people, no self-government in the Catholic Church.

No Christian can defend the right of the people to self-government in the sense of Rousseau's theory.

Every Catholic may defend as true, the opinion that civil authority comes immediately from the people and mediately from God.

Every Catholic of the United States can, like any other citizen, acknowledge the right of self-government guaranteed by the Constitution, and his religious principles need not suffer in the least. He may also consider this system as the best one for this country. He may also advocate that it be introduced into all countries for which it is suitable. Finally, he, like every other citizen, has the obligation to render obedience to the government established according to the principles of the Constitution.

Now, it may be asked, does all this remain true, if we judge the Roman Question as the Pope does? if we not only desire the restoration of the Temporal Power, but also defend it?

Yes, even in this case, all this remains true! Nor do we contradict in any way our political views, or act contrary to our civil duties. If we Catholics acted otherwise *we would be illogical* and disloyal to our religious convictions.

Let us consider in the first place the *national standpoint*. As citizens of the United States we must unreservedly acknowledge the Constitution, in the above sense, and fulfill our duties accordingly. The obligation of a good citizen extends no further; it cannot extend further unless the liberty guaranteed by this very Constitution be only such in name. Or is it perhaps American to say: Every nation of the earth *must* be governed according to the same principles? This would be a ridiculous assumption. Is it necessary to pronounce the death sentence on all monarchies in order to be a true republican? This would be a contradiction of the very principle of self-government, which allows a people to transfer the supreme authority to any form of government, monarchical or democratic. Indeed, one can be a good citizen of any State, without maintaining its form of government to be absolutely or even relatively the best. If this were not so what would become of liberty of thought? of liberty of science and research? It would be downright tyranny if a government, if a people strove thus to fetter free thought.

Must a citizen of the United States approve of *every* revolution by which governments are overthrown? Such theories would declare revolutions the order of the day! Even the American people, notwithstanding its sovereignty, has no right violently to overthrow the Constitution; it has not even a right to forcibly oust the President or a majority in Congress before their term of office has expired. Thus, though every form of government be an immediately human institution, still from the very nature of the case it is a *permanent manner and means* of exercising authority, and the people must pay deference to it as such.¹

¹ "We utterly deny the right of revolution, or the right to resist, for any purpose whatever, legitimate government in the legal discharge of its functions. We repeat

Now what must our judgment be on the spoliation of the Papal States by Victor Emmanuel, considering it as a mere political event.

Let us first merely glance at the overthrow of the Pope's Temporal Power. The Italian or Roman people as such did not perpetrate that robbery. It was Freemasonry and the Piedmontese thirst for spoils which committed the outrage. The Roman plebiscitum of October 2, 1870, was a mere comedy and can in no way be said to have been the manifestations of the "sovereign will of the people," even if we allowed that the subjects of the Pope were sovereign. At present, however, we only wish to lay stress on the ground of principle. We therefore say: the Pope is as legitimately and rightfully the sovereign of the Papal States as any monarch or Executive Ruler, the whole world over. The legitimate form of government in his kingdom was always a purely monarchical one. Therefore the Temporal Power could not be set aside upon the plea of popular sovereignty—not by the Romans and much less by other Italians, except by the violation of justice and fidelity.

Some will say: We do not approve of the spoliation of the Papal States; but now we are face to face with the *fait accompli*, and behold it sanctioned by the Italian people. The explanation and application of the proposition "*Salus publica suprema lex*," will thoroughly answer this difficulty. (See B.)

Let us now give expression to our *Catholic conviction* on this question, by considering its *religious side*.

The Liberty—dearest of all which our Constitution permits us to enjoy, is liberty of conscience, religious freedom; the freedom to openly profess our faith and practice it by fulfilling the duties which it enjoins upon us.

As Catholics we believe that the successor of St. Peter is divinely appointed by God, to rule the entire Church, free and independent of any earthly power; and that all Catholics owe him unqualified obedience.

Furthermore we believe that the Bishop of Rome and only the Bishop of Rome, is the successor of St. Peter.

then, that the right of rebellion and revolution on the part of the people, is no right at all. The people can never have the right to act, save through the forms prescribed by the supreme authority." (Brownson, xv., p. 398). "The people of the United States and of the several states can amend the Constitution, but only constitutionally, through the government. The notion which has latterly gained some vogue, that there persists always a sovereign people back of the government or constitution or organic people, competent to alter, change, modify, or overturn the existing government at will, is purely revolutionary, fatal to all state government, to all political authority, to the peace and order of society, and to all security for liberty, either public or private."—(*id.* vol. xviii., p. 451).

Our faith then teaches us that the Bishop of Rome by Divine right must rule the Church freely and independently and that we owe him childlike submission.

It is therefore the will of God that the freedom of the Pope be *secure in Rome*, in order that he be truly independent in leading the whole flock of Christ.

This conclusion no Catholic can deny without a severe shock to the Dogma of the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. The following conclusion is just as firm: Against the will of God there is no sovereignty upon earth, no sovereignty of the Cæsars, no sovereignty of one people or of all people taken together.

Hence, no Catholic can ever approve of any act or condition of things, by which the Pope is bereft of his full freedom and liberty.

"*Illa autem, quae sursum est Jerusalem, libera est quae est mater nostra!*" "Free she must be, that Jerusalem which is our Mother!" "*Itaque fratres, non sumus ancillæ filii, sed liberae, qua libertate Christus nos liberavit!*" "We are not the children of a slave, but of a mother who is free-born." "We claim for her that freedom which Christ our Lord purchased for her" (Gal. ii.). These grand words come to the mind of a Catholic when he raises his eyes and looks aloft to the Roman Church, the mother and teacher of all the churches of the globe. The lamentations of Jeremiah are inadequate to give expression to his sorrow, when this Jerusalem, "the ruler of nations," "the Queen of the Provinces is robbed of her freedom."

The Roman Church then must be free; free in the person of her Bishop, the head of the Church. But now if the Pope has received from God the *right* to exercise his sublime office most fully and without molestation, he thereby also has a right to the *means* necessary for the perfecting of that liberty; he has a right to determine and demand them. These means may differ as times and circumstances change. We are only concerned with one of them now—the Temporal Power of the Popes.

Assuming then, as true, the doctrine of the Primacy, (*a) common sense* must tell every one, that the Pope is truly free *in Rome* when he is in no way subject there to another, in no way dependent upon another; that moreover, this independence has its safest guarantee, and is most effectually secure against every extraneous influence, when the Pope himself is likewise the temporal ruler of Rome.

If we consult (*b) history* we are told that the Popes after the division of the Roman Empire, and since the fifth century, possessed some political power in Rome, which subsequently developed into a truly regal power, and that the Popes during eleven centuries held and exercised that power.

Now the (*c*) *Christian concept* of the Church and of Divine Providence tells us that God "who loves nothing dearer than the freedom of his Church" (St. Bernard), thus shaped events that the freedom of the Head of the Church should be made secure by his Temporal Power, "singulari scilicet prorsus divinae Providentiae consilio factum est, ut Romano Imperio in plura regna variasque ditiones diviso, Romanus Pontifex . . . civilem principatum haberet."¹

Furthermore the (*d*) *events* of the last twenty years sadly but unmistakably prove, that the Pope is no longer free to exercise his office in Rome in a manner becoming its importance and dignity; since Victor Emmanuel forcibly entered by the Porta Pia and took possession of Rome as King of Italy; since the Pope in spite of all guarantees is completely dependent upon government measures and the whims of ministers, Chambers of Parliament, and the rabble; in fine, since he is at the mercy and good pleasure of others.

Lastly, we know from the clear and positive (*e*) *utterances of the Popes* themselves, "that the Temporal Power of the Pope is necessary at present in order that he may, freely and independently, of any power or secular prince, rule and guide the entire Church."²

The last reason alone would be more than sufficient.

The Pope is the competent judge in this question. Every Catholic must accept humbly his declaration. But we add, and Pius IX. emphasized it in the allocution quoted above, that the *Episcopacy* of the whole world more than once has repeated these same declarations of the Head of the Church.

It is not incumbent upon a Catholic, therefore, to defend the Temporal Power *because* the Pope was the legitimate prince of Rome, who was unjustifiably and violently despoiled of his temporal possessions. No, the real and true reason why Catholics defend the Temporal Power is a deeper one: They defend the liberty of the Pope inasmuch as he is Pope, *i.e.*, inasmuch as he is lawfully constituted the Head of the Church by Jesus Christ. It is a question, therefore, of defending that liberty and independence to which the divine Founder of the Church has given His Representative an inalienable right. In defending his rights he is defending our rights as Catholics. The means to preserve intact this freedom is the temporal dominion. Therefore our conclusion runs thus: Just as no power on earth has the slightest right to destroy the freedom of the sovereign Pontiff, which God wills, so also no emperor, no king, no people, has any right whatever to deprive the Pope of the temporal power which he needs

¹ Allocution of Pius IX., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849. Letter of Leo XIII. to Card. Rampolla.

² Allocution of Pius IX., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862; Leo XIII., l. c.

and must have to govern the Church with the freedom willed by Christ. The sovereign freedom of the successor of St. Peter is to-day necessarily conditioned by his temporal sovereignty; therefore the latter, through the former, is rendered sacred and inviolable; and to attack it, is to assail Christ Himself, in the person of His representative.

Therefore Victor Emmanuel had no more right to deprive the Pope of his Papal States than had Napoleon I.; therefore the occupation of Rome will ever be a sacrilege no matter by what people it was effected. We say a *sacrilege*, for such in very truth it is: "peccatum contra immunitatem loci sacri," and as *prescription* has no force against "*res sacrae*" and "*jura ecclesiastica*," so also the spoliation of Rome cannot be legalized by any title whatever. Hence the Constitution "*Apostolicae Sedis*" places the ban of Excommunication (speciali modo Romano Pontifici reservata) upon, "*Invadentes, destruentes, detinentes vel per se vel per alios civitates, terras, loca, aut jura ad Ecclesiam Romanam pertinentes, vel usurpantes, perturbantes, retinentes supremam jurisdictionem in eis nec non ad singula praedicta, auxilium, consilium, favorem praebentes.*" "On all who either themselves or through others invade, destroy, retain the cities, lands, places or rights belonging to the Roman Church, or who usurp, disturb, retain supreme jurisdiction therein; also on all who give help, counsel, favor to any of the aforesaid things." (I. 12). Is this excommunication of itself not sufficiently expressive for every Catholic, who knows that it is the severest ecclesiastical punishment, and always presupposes grave sin? Can there be any right or any principle to justify that sin? Knowing this must not every Catholic openly condemn the *invasio* and *detentio*? Unless he does so he is in direct opposition with the Pope and with himself. Solicitude for the maintenance of a so-called political or national principle would then lead to the denial of an undeniable Catholic principle!¹

¹ A remark of St. Thomas on a similar subject may appropriately illustrate these deductions. The Angelical Doctor, as is well known, along with the majority of mediæval theologians defends the opinion that civil authority proceeds immediately from the people. Treating on the laws and customs of the Old Testament he makes the objection: "With the Jews the election of rulers was not sufficiently provided for, since no direction had been given to the people in this regard." He answers the objection as follows: "Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod populus ille sub speciali cura Dei regebatur: unde dicitur (*Deut. vii., 6.*): Te elegit dominus Deus tuus ut sis ei populus peculiaris Et ideo institutionem summi principis . . . electionem regis non commisit Dominus populo, sed sibi reservavit, ut patet (*Deut. xvii., 15.*): Eum constitues regem quem Dominus Deus tuus elegerit."* I. 2. q. 105, a. 1. Hence according to Aquinas

* "That people was governed under the special care of God; whence it is said (*Deut. vii. 6.*) 'The Lord thy God has chosen thee to be His peculiar people,' therefore the Lord did not commit the election of the supreme ruler, the choice of the king to the people, but reserved it to Himself, as is clear from *Deut. xvii. 15.* 'Thou shalt set him king whom the Lord thy God shall choose.'"'

It is our duty to speak plainly and forcibly. On the Roman question the religious side is and remains for us the main point. Our non-Catholic fellow-citizens will not recognize this argument as the only true one, because they reject the religious principles on which it is grounded. They deny moreover *all* spiritual sovereignty of the Pope; hence, *a fortiori*, his "right to independence." But they cannot gainsay our right to remain true and loyal to our religious principles. Do we Catholics enjoy only a partial or an imperfect liberty of conscience? They cannot but respect consistency; while shameful compromise and cowardly faint-heartedness will surely not gain their esteem. Let us cling, therefore, above all, to the great American principle that we are free citizens and esteem Religious Liberty above all else. Let us proclaim it clearly and positively: Yes, as Americans we hold firmly to our Constitution, to "the right of self-government" and "republican principles. We believe also that in general, civil authority comes only mediately from God and immediately from the people; but we also hold that there may be other legitimate titles to this authority. We have neither the right nor the intention to impose our views on others. Just as it is not contradictory to *our* "republican principles" that monarchies exist *elsewhere*, so also we cannot reject *a priori* a Constitution that does not recognize the sovereignty of the people. In any case, not even the most sovereign people in the world can have a right to violate the ordinances of God. But we Catholics behold in the Papacy an immediate institution of God, and in the Temporal Power the necessary condition of the divinely-ordained freedom of the Pope! Therefore, according to Catholic principles, there is no right in the world, the right of self-government not excepted, which can destroy that freedom. Hence we may also apply to the Roman question:

"Quod Deus coniunxit homo non separet!"

"What God hath joined let not man put asunder!"

there could be no question about the election of a ruler—about the exercise of the sovereignty of the people in the proper sense of the term—because there can be no right of the people *against the ordinances of God*. Now we say a pari or ab analogo: God provides in a special manner for His "populus peculiaris," the *Holy Catholic Church*, and in her more especially for the Roman Church, whose Bishop by His express command was to be the successor of St. Peter—the Head of the Church. By the *providentia specialis Dei* it came about that also the temporal sovereignty over Rome was given to the successors of St. Peter, in order that they might exercise freely and independently their sublime office. Hence with regard to the Roman people it is true that since they are the objects of God's special providence, *He has not committed to them the election of a ruler, but has reserved to Himself, i.e., to his Church, the right to determine, by the election of the Pope, the person who is to be the King of Rome.*

We will conclude this part of our argument with the words of Brownson, who was ever proud of being an American citizen, and whom all Americans claim as their own: "It is enough to say that the Pope never was a subject of any temporal prince, and *never can be*. He represents Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. He is above all earthly monarchs, by the law of Christ; the status of prince belongs to him by right of his office as Vicar of Christ, for by that office he is declared independent, and clothed with plenary authority to govern all men and nations in all things relating to salvation."¹ "The Roman or ecclesiastical state was a donation to the Holy See or to the Church of Rome. Gifts to the Church are gifts to God, and when made are the property, under Him, of the spirituality, which by no laws, heathen, Jewish, or Christian, can be deprived of their possession or use without sacrilege. They are sacred to religious uses, and can no longer, without the consent of the spirituality, be diverted to temporal uses, without *adding sacrilege to robbery*. Whoso attacks the spirituality attacks God. The temporal power of the Pope is therefore not within the category of any earthly human government, but is the property of the spirituality. Victor Emmanuel, in despoiling the Pope, has usurped Church property, property given to God, and sacred to religious uses. The deed, which our eminent jurists and Protestant divines sympathize with and applaud, strikes a blow at the spirituality, at the sacredness of all Church property, of Protestant churches as well as of Catholic churches,—at the sacredness of all eleemosynary gifts and asserts the right of power when strong enough to divert them from the purposes of the donors Or are they (the Protestant divines) so intent on crushing the Papacy that they are quite willing to cut their own throats?"²

B.—Salus Publica Suprema Lex.

We cheerfully admit this principle. It does not militate against the re-establishment of the Temporal Power, but is rather a confirmation of its usefulness and necessity. It shows both in a brighter and clearer light. Let us therefore briefly consider its essence and the deductions made from it in the light of Christian jurisprudence and according to the teaching of Christian moralists.

The common good is to be placed above that of the individual;

¹ See vol. 12, *Pope and Emperor*, p. 456.

² See vol. 18, *Sardinia and the Holy Father*, p. 451. This article carries the greater weight with it, because it was written in 1871, a year after the spoliation of the Holy See, and in order to refute the arguments of Dr. Thompson and other Protestants who pretended to defend the "sovereignty of the Roman people," saying that the sovereignty of the Roman State "is in the category of all earthly sovereignties."

hence duties towards society precede, generally speaking, those towards self. The temporal welfare of the people is the immediate end of civil society. Governmental *régime* exists not for its own sake, but for the people. A change of government or a change in the form of government, brought about by any event whatsoever, may be legitimate, even though effected by unlawful means. It suffices that the former state of affairs may have become hurtful or impossible, and that, accordingly, the welfare of the entire society requires the subsequent situation to be upheld by all. Even he who does not admit the lawfulness of our Revolutionary War with Great Britain, or the Belgian revolution in 1830, must declare that the forms of government thus brought about are perfectly legitimate. But if the above conditions are not verified, the members of such a society may tolerate the change of government, but cannot directly lend their aid to confirm or maintain it.

If the claims of *different societies* be compared, precedence, *ceteris paribus*, must be given to the highest and most important. Since every society is made up of a number of rational beings to secure a more or less determined end, it is evident, that the dignity of a society depends upon the loftiness of its end and on the greater number of intelligent beings who are striving for that end. This truth must ever be borne in mind when considering civil and religious society, the State and the Church.

The State has for its immediate end the temporal welfare of its subjects; the Church, the eternal welfare, the salvation of mankind. Inasmuch as eternal salvation is of far greater importance, nay more necessary, than temporal happiness, by so much the Church, the mediator of eternal happiness, by divine appointment, must take precedence in dignity over every civil society. There exists therefore a true subordination of the State to the Church, and the Church cannot be made subservient to the State, and no perishable temporal considerations can prevent her from using the necessary means to attain her sublime end.

The ecclesiastical as well as the civil power are both supreme in their respective domains; but, though each has its own sphere, both should act conjointly for the welfare of humanity; they should mutually assist one another. But the Church, because of her exalted end, is superior to the State, "as the soul is superior to the body, as the sky is above the earth" (St. Chrysostom). "Or should the spirit give place to the flesh, the celestial to the terrestrial?" (St. Gregory Naz.).

Moreover, the Church surpasses also in excellence the civil organization of any people or nation, because her organization embraces a wider field. Her welfare, is the welfare of all her children who are scattered over the entire globe; nay more, that of all men, for whom she was instituted.

This is why, in case of a conflict between Church and State—*e.g.*, when both claim jurisdiction for their respective ends—precedence must be given to the Church. This is no “individual theory.” It is catholic teaching, which can be proven by sound reason and which Leo XIII., in union with the Fathers and theologians, has clearly and distinctly explained.¹

Suppose, that the temporal advantages of a nation come in conflict with the welfare of the Church, to which that nation belongs, or hinders the Church in the attainment of her end, then evidently that nation must make its temporal interests subservient to the higher interest of the Church—which is identical with the nation’s own higher interests—and with the higher interests of the faithful at large.²

These are the conclusions which faith and reason draw from the principle “*Salus publica suprema lex.*”

I.—THE WELFARE OF THE WHOLE CHURCH DEMANDS THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.

The objection brought against this principle when applied to the Roman question may be stated thus, in clear terms:

“Private interests must give way when there is a question of public welfare or of the common good.

“Now, the welfare of the Romans and Italians, that is, the public welfare of Italy, demands the maintenance of the present political situation of their country; consequently the Pope’s temporal power must be permanently abolished. It is therefore the Pope’s duty to renounce his claims to temporal sovereignty, or at least, Catholics need not strive to reestablish it.”

The first proposition is true, but it proves just the contrary of what our opponents deduce from it.

Facts show the second proposition to be false; *but even granted it be true*, it would prove nothing against us. Hence, in any case, the conclusion is false. We prove this as follows:

As temporal welfare must be subordinate to the spiritual, so likewise must the incidental claims of a single nation be subordinate to the demands of the Church and the Catholic world at large. Now the Roman question means the security of a spiritual good,

¹ Particularly in the Encyclicals “*Immortale Dei*,” “*Quod Apostolici Muneris*,” “*Humanum Genus*,” “*Diuturnum*.” There is no need of citing authors in confirmation of the above-mentioned principles; they may be found in any treatise on Christian Jurisprudence. Cf. especially Card Hergenröther, *Staat und Kirche*, viii., “Die Lehre von der Superiorität der Kirche und ihrer Gewalt über das Zeitliche.

² On the subject, “How the Church, notwithstanding her higher aim, or rather by means of it, promotes the temporal well-being of nations,” Cf. Encyclical of Leo XIII., “*Humanum Genus*.”

the security of ecclesiastical liberty, through the territorial independence of the Head of the Church; a claim most intimately associated with the well-being of the Church and the interests of two hundred millions of Catholics.

Hence *Salus rei publicæ Christianæ supra lex!*

Rome, therefore, belongs to the Church, to her visible Head, and therefore to the whole Catholic world! The Papal States are the incontestable heritage of the common father of Christendom, the "patrimonium Petri." Romans and Italians have no right to rob Rome of its essential character, that of the centre of the Church, the Capitol of the Catholic world! Even though their claims be unanimous; even though they gained thereby a national advantage by despoiling the Pope, and subjecting the Vicar of Christ to a temporal king!

Italy, therefore, has the obligation towards the Pope, towards the Church, towards the Catholics of the whole world, to restore to the Pope that liberty and independence indispensable to the government of the Church, viz., his Temporal Power.

This is the unbending logic of philosophy, the logic of the ecclesiastical standpoint, the logic of Catholic consciousness.

The following proposition stands out clearly in the light of present events: In order to enjoy *sovereign liberty*, as the Head of the Church, the Pope must be a *temporal sovereign*. Only lately three enemies of the Papacy furnished eloquent commentaries upon the outrageous occurrences of last October—commentaries that must come home forcibly to the blindest adherents of Nationalism and Modernism. They were the speech of Minister Rudini at Milan; the circular of the Jew Lemmi, the Grand-Master of Italian Freemasonry, to the Italian : "Brethren," and the agitation of the demagogue, Menotti Garibaldi, against the so-called Guarantee-Law.

True it is, that the Church will survive, as some timid persons are fond of saying, though days of worse captivity and still greater affliction be in store for the venerable sufferer in the chair of St. Peter. She lived through ages of persecution when almost all her Popes reddened the chair of St. Peter with their life's blood. And she will live through the same ordeal again, by virtue of the Divine life dwelling within her. But are these the sentiments of a child realizing the sublime dignity of its mother? Is this the language of one who glories in his faith and is proud of being a Catholic? Every true Catholic understands the "*non possumus*" of the successor of St. Peter in an entirely different sense; and from deep conviction, proclaims with him, that "the Temporal Power of the Pope is at the present time not only *useful* but *necessary* for the liberty of the Church." Necessary, because the

Church has not only a right to live, but also the right to live free and unmolested! Necessary, because she has not merely the right to conceal herself in the catacombs, under the surveillance of a Questor, by the grace of the State, but she has the right to show her everlastingly youthful, beautiful and venerable countenance to all people! Because she has not merely the right to pass by the palaces of the mighty in the ragged garb of a poor servant maid, a beggar imploring a place of shelter, but she has the right to pass majestically through human society, a royal personage with power to command and a gracious blessing for all, a queen adorned with that royal crown which the eternal King placed on her brow when he purchased her, on the Cross, at the price of His Precious Blood!

II.—THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TEMPORAL POWER, A BENEFIT TO ITALY ITSELF.

It only remains for us to show in a brief way that in the Roman question it cannot be said that Rome and Italy must sacrifice their temporal advantage for the common good of Christianity. The opposite is true. We will only mention the following facts:

a. It is not true that the overthrow of the Pope's Temporal Power was the work of the Roman or Italian people, and that the present situation fulfils the desire of the *people*. We do not mean that the Italians may not be justly reproached for lack of energy in proclaiming their Catholic sentiments. Nevertheless, Leo XIII. gave expression to the truth, on different occasions, when he said, that the great majority of the Italian people faithfully adhered to the Roman See. It was the confirmation of this fact, by the grand demonstration of October 1, 1891, in St. Peter's, when with 20,000 pilgrims, not less than 40,000 Romans and Italians knelt at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff, that induced the Grand Master Lemmi to issue an impassioned circular.¹

b. Far from having promoted the welfare of Rome and Italy, the proclamation of Italian Unity has caused it to suffer greatly and has well nigh ruined it. Rome and all Italy are suffering from the "*mal di Roma*," the Roman plague, that is, financial embarrassment and poverty, the outcome of the mania for political ascendancy. The straits in which New Italy finds herself, plainly

¹ The well-known liberal deputy, Fazzeri, presented the following programme to his constituents: "The reconciliation between the Roman See and our Government is the highest need, the most urgent necessity and the sincerest wish of our Fatherland." He was elected to Parliament by an immense majority. Distinguished conservatives wrote to him: "All Italians feel the truth of your resolution, but few have the courage to declare it openly to the official world." Cf. "la Conciliazione tra il Papato e l'Italia." Florence, 1887.

verifies the saying of Thiers: "*Qui mange du Pape en meurt*," "To eat of the Pope is death." The Italians, whose sensitiveness in money matters is proverbial, understand the practical application of the well-known adage: "*la farina del diavolo va tutta in cruseia*;" "The devil's meal all turns into bran." Even those, who out of inborn cowardice join in the cry "*Evviva l' Italia unita*," will tell a stranger in a significant and plaintive way: "*Si stava meglio quando si stava peggio*." "We fared much better when we were worse off.

A living proof of what kind of blessing the new kingdom showers on Italy's population, is the great mass of poverty-stricken Italian emigrants who daily land on our shores.¹

c. National honor and glory! That Providence selected Italy for the seat of the Papacy, is her fairest fame, her greatest glory! It was the Pope who added the most celebrated pages to Italy's history. The glorious traditions of the land, its splendid achievements in the domain of science and the arts, all are to this day most intimately connected with the names of the Popes.²

d. Even from an international standpoint, Italy's great misfortune is and will be the Roman question. Without Crispi's notorious declarations, his angry speeches and his frivolous article in the "*North American Review*," it is as clear as day-light to the unbiased mind that Italy keeps an immense standing army, which consumes millions and millions, for no other purpose than to guard her spoils against the protestations of the Catholic world. For that very reason the Roman question will always be a question of the day, despite the efforts and tricks of diplomacy, until the sacred right of St. Peter's successor is restored to him. Never will the two hundred million children of the Pope cease to accuse Italy of the crime committed against their common father, and demand back his freedom. They will be louder in their claims, the longer the Head of the Church is kept in prison. The world's legions of soldiery are not able to smother the voice of the Pontiffs and deaden the ring of its echo, in the hearts of the faithful and prevent its re-echo from their lips. And now can there be any question about the lawlessness of a state of affairs, which leaves to so many subjects of the usurper the only alternative, either to transgress a religious duty, to refuse obedience to the Church and the Vicar of Christ, or, to look upon the Italian kingdom in its present form as the enemy of the Holy See and of the Church? We say "*Italy in its present form*"; for the union of all under the

¹ Cf. "*La question Romaine au point de une financier*," Office of the *Osservatore Catholicico*, Milan.

² Leo XIII, to the Italian Bishops, February 15, 1882.

sway of the King of Piedmont is not at all a necessary condition for the oneness of the nation! Were the Popes ever opposed to a federative union of Italy? Did not the united cities of the land in earlier times find precisely in the Papacy their most active representative, protector and defender? And now, to conclude: Would not united Italy be powerful enough without Rome? Would it not, above all, be a more blissful Union?

e. Would it not be a benefit, in the word's truest sense, to the world, to all civilized nations, if the Popes should again be universally acknowledged and appealed to as the arbitrators in international differences?

But in order that all nations and in every instance, may resort to such an arbiter and peace-maker, with full confidence, he needs must be entirely independent, a prince himself, in his own free right. Who is there who does not pray for such an arbitrator? All, including the enemies of the Church, must admit that there can be no person better qualified for that sacred trust than the Pope. Therefore the *salus publica*, the public common good of humanity in this regard too, demands his perfect freedom and liberty.

III.—WASHINGTON, D. C., AND ROME.

The relation of the District of Columbia to the United States strikingly resembles the relation of Rome to the Catholic Church. Space will only allow us simply to indicate the line of thought. The Constitution explicitly states that "Congress shall exercise *exclusive legislative power in all cases whatever over a district*" set apart for the government of the nation.¹ Now, the inhabitants of the District of Columbia are more numerous than those of certain States; nevertheless they have no representatives in Congress, no right to vote on national issues in the district; not even the right to elect municipal officers. The *proximate* reason of such a wise measure is the *independence* of the legislative and ruling power of the United States; the *ultimate* reason: the welfare of all the States, of the *whole country*! We ask: Did the decree of 1801 ask the consent of the Washingtonians? By no means. Are the people of Washington "*sovereign*?" Can they *change* this article of the Constitution, even if its population of 200,000 unanimously demanded it? Not at all. What would be the answer of Congress, of all Americans, to such claims? Simply this: it is *an honor and a privilege* for Washington to be the capital of the United States; but its citizens must sacrifice some political rights exercised by other citizens, because: *salus publica suprema lex!* *the welfare of the whole country demands it!*

¹ Constitution of the United States, xvii, clause, 8th sect. 1st art.

We say *a pari* and *a fortiori*: According to the *divine Constitution* of the Church, Rome is the centre and capital of the Catholic world, the seat of government of the Church. Hence the Roman Pontiff must have "*exclusive legislative power*" over Rome! Therefore Italy is honored with the highest privilege of Divine Providence, but it has at the same time the sacred duty towards all Catholic nations, towards Catholics of the whole world, to sacrifice certain political or national rights, if there should be such, in order to insure the complete independence of the Pope and thereby the well-being of the whole Catholic Church.¹

CONCLUSION.

The re-establishment of the Temporal Power therefore can in no way and in no sense be injurious to Rome or to Italy. Is a re-establishment *possible*? History has answered this question over and over again in the most unequivocal manner. Our own century has been the witness, both in 1815 and 1849 of how wonderfully God directs His Church in troublesome times, and prepares new triumphs for her in her persecuted Head. We therefore do not ask: *when* will God hear the supplications of the Catholic world for its captive father? *how*, under the present circumstances, Providence will again give to the Bishop of Rome the temporal sway over the eternal city? will it be brought about amicably and peacefully? or must the crime against the Vicar of Christ be expiated in blood? God alone knows.² "Never was the papal independency more seriously threatened than now, since the conversion of the

¹ Rev. H. A. Brann, D.D., in his learned pamphlet, *The Schism of the West* draws the following just conclusion about the *election* of the Pope: "We learn from this schism how dangerous it is to the peace of the Church to permit any secular power to have influence in the Conclave. The election of the Pope should be absolutely free so as to forestall excuses for schism. Hence the place of the Conclave should be subject to no prince. The Popes should be temporal sovereigns; their territory, be it great or small, absolutely inviolable; and in that territory the Conclave ought to be held. The Schism of the West furnishes arguments for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. There are some, I know, who dream of a possible spiritual independence of the Papacy, without temporal power. But we ask when or where the Popes were absolutely free, *de jure* and *de facto*, except when they were temporal sovereigns. They should be perfectly free *de jure* as well as *de facto*, and this is only possible with the temporal power restored. All the facts of history are against the platonic dream of a spiritual independence of the papacy when it is subject to king, kaiser or mob. The restoration of the temporal power is therefore a necessary guarantee to the freedom of the Conclave. The attempt of Crispi, the late prime-minister of the king of Sardinia, to get a pledge from the *Dreibund* to coerce the future Conclave to elect a Pope who would sanction Sardinian usurpation, shows what is to be expected of any civil government which can claim the Pope as a subject."—*The Schism of the West and the Freedom of Papal Elections*, New York, Benziger Brothers, 1882, p. 30, 31.

² Divine Providence does not recognize the so-called "principle of non-intervention," and God has not yet emancipated the world.

Roman empire. Never was the *duty of defending it more urgent, and never was it more necessary that all loyal Catholics should be on the alert to discover and defeat the machinations of the politicians,*" said Brownson, writing in 1861. ("Pope and Emperor," vol. 12, p. 457, seq.) It would certainly be desirable that a settlement be effected by *Italy herself* or at least with *Italy's co-operation*. Such a solution, humanly speaking, would in every respect be more advantageous and more lasting.

In the meantime, it is the duty of Catholics in every land, now that Rudini in his speech has shown himself a master in political hypocrisy, to openly, positively and persistently urge the rightful demands of the Catholic world. Just claims do not secure a hearing in any other way nowadays. In this way alone does a numerical minority gain public recognition. Those who stand aside and only call upon heaven to witness their protest, will never prevent the usurping power from calling for the order of the day. The more active and vigorous *international action* is, in this case, the heavier will be its weight with the governments, the more powerful its efficacy, the more speedy its success. Again, the more outspoken Catholics are in a country where they enjoy greater liberty, the greater will be their influence upon public opinion. This shows how true the statement is, that a Catholic Congress cannot be thought of to-day, in which the condition of the Holy Father is not made the common subject of discussion and of most eloquent protestation. Therefore the Holy Father heartily welcomed the idea of an international Catholic Congress on the Roman question. It will be most eminently a Congress of Peace. Let us meanwhile follow the noble example which the Holy Father gives us. "We place our trust in God," said Leo XIII. in an address, "and are determined to contend with all our might for the freedom of the Church and its Head. . . . We are moreover not alone in this conflict." No, Holy Father, you are not alone in this conflict! Your devoted bishops and priests, all your faithful children pray and protest with you! Our trust, like yours, is in the Lord, who above all else, loves the freedom of His Church! The day will come, the longed-for day of deliverance! The successor of the Prince of the Apostles will again ascend the venerable throne which centuries erected for the Papacy, to shed new lustre upon the Church, to spread over all the world the beneficent influence of the apostolic word, to be free again to bestow his blessing without let or hindrance, upon the Eternal City and the entire world, *Urbi et Orbi!*

JOSEPH SHROEDER, D.D.

OUR YOUNG MEN—WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR THEM?

EVERY one knows that for a long time this question about the young men has been before the public. Societies for their benefit, societies founded and conducted on lines quite different, in many respects, from those of purely religious sodalities, have been established. Much attention has been given to these organizations. In many places they have been joined together in Diocesan Unions for mutual improvement. They have even a large, strong and active National Union, the object of which is, and has been for years, to assert in trumpet tones the necessity of these associations; to urge their establishment in every parish, if possible, throughout the whole country; to bring to their aid the sympathy and the co-operation of the pastors, of laymen of distinction, wealth and experience, and even of the bishops themselves.

The movement is already very large. Those who believe in it believe with their whole hearts. The annual gatherings of the National Union have been invariably blessed by the Holy Father himself. The most illustrious prelates in the land have not hesitated to give their cordial approbation. Bishop Keane, now the Rector of the American Catholic University, Mgr. Preston, the late Vicar-General of New York, Mgr. Doane, then Vicar-General of Newark, Father Mitchell, now the Vicar-General of Brooklyn, have been among the Presidents of the National Union. Cardinal McCloskey blessed and favored it during his life. His successor, the illustrious Archbishop Corrigan, has many times expressed his hearty co-operation with the movement, and he officially appoints the President of the Diocesan Union in New York. Cardinal Gibbons honored the opening of the sixteenth convention, held in Washington, in October, 1890, with his presence. He made there one of the most ringing and eloquent of his speeches, applauding the work of the delegates and giving them every encouragement that could be accorded to the propagators of a great work. The Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, performed a similar office for the seventeenth convention, held in the City of Brotherly Love, in October, 1891. No one who was present on the occasion, and who heard the fervid eloquence and the convincing logic of the argument made by America's greatest preacher, could ever doubt for a moment the utility of the work he so splendidly commended. The Archbishops of Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, St. Paul, and

Oregon have all publicly declared their interest and approval. There is scarcely a bishop in the country who has not at some time or other given open expression to his earnest desire that these societies for the young men be established and that they grow and flourish like the bay tree. But the loudest voice of all is that of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. Here are its words : " We consider as worthy of particular encouragement associations for the promotion of healthful social union among Catholics, and especially those whose aim is to guard our Catholic young men against the dangerous influences, and to supply them with means of innocent amusement and mental culture. It is obvious that our young men are exposed to the greatest dangers and they need the most abundant helps. Hence, in the spirit of our Holy Father, Leo the XIII., we desire to see the number of thoroughly Catholic and well organized associations for their benefit greatly increased, especially in our large cities. We exhort pastors to consider the formation and careful direction of such societies as one of their most important duties. And we appeal to our young men to put to good profit the best years of their lives, by combining together under the direction of their pastors, for mutual improvement and encouragement in the paths of faith and of virtue.

" And in order to acknowledge the great amount of good that the Catholic young men of the National Union have accomplished ; to promote the growth of the Union, and to stimulate its members to greater efforts in the future ; we cordially bless their aims and endeavors, and we recommend the Union to all our Catholic young men."

This recommendation, so wisely worded, so logical in its premises and conclusions, coming from an authority than which there is nothing higher or greater on earth (for it must not be forgotten that the Acts of the Council were revised and approved by the Holy Father himself), should be enough to settle forever all questions as to the advisability and the utility of these societies.

Nevertheless, it will do no harm to review the field a little. Extrinsic evidence is surely very weighty. But a man never loves anything so well as when he sees its intrinsic merit by the light of his own intellect. Therefore, let us inquire, first, what is the necessity for this work ; secondly, what has been done thus far ; thirdly, what can be reasonably hoped for in the future ?

What is the necessity ? Young men encounter more temptations than any other class of people. Men who have passed the years of early youth, who are married, who have families growing up about them, to whom they must, through every motive of self-interest, show good example, can easily lead moral lives and be good Catholics, provided, of course, they do not go astray during

the years when their adult life was beginning. As for woman, God has made her a natural priestess. Her character is such that, under ordinary circumstances, she will be, without difficulty, a model of faith, modesty, sobriety and patience to the world. She has comparatively few temptations and she is surrounded by safeguards on every side.

But the young man is the one whose position is really dangerous. Pleasure, drink, ambition pursue him like wolves. Unfortunately, he is as free as the bird of the air. He can go where he will. He may read, hear, see everything. If he be rich and high-placed he is tempted to underestimate the value of his heritage of faith by the fact that such a great majority in the upper stratum of society are not yet Catholics. If he be poor, it may seem to him that all the short roads to wealth and prominence lead through Protestantism and Infidelity. Whether he be rich or poor, the gilded palaces of drink and sin hold for him always wide-open doors. But why prolong this narration? Every pastor of souls, every father of a family, every man who has passed through the dangerous years, and who recollects his own temptations, knows perfectly well the perils that beset the period of life of which we are speaking. And few there are who can restrain a tear as they remember the sad wrecks from among their own early companions and friends, who stranded on this treacherous shore.

We want therefore, something that will prove a safeguard against these dangers, a breakwater that will keep our golden youth outside the line of the shallows and the shoals. We need something which will preserve their attachment to the Church, to their bishops and their pastors; something that will save their hearts from corruption and their minds from blight, during those years when the character of their temptations is such as to make them, at first, afraid of the Sacraments: and later on, anxious for a pretext to abandon that faith which is so galling to the natural inclinations of their hearts.

But will not the schools do this? No human tongue or pen can ever adequately praise the work done by our Catholic schools. No amount of appreciation can ever be too great for those devoted bishops, pastors and people, for those illustrious children of St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Vincent de Paul and blessed de la Salle, who, in spite of the greatest difficulties, in the face of poverty and of prejudice, notwithstanding opposition from without and from within, pushed on bravely the work of the schools and made them what they are to-day, the palladium of Catholicity in this land. May God's blessing rest on them and on their efforts. May their success go on increasing and spreading with every day. It can never be greater than it deserves to be. But the school

cannot do all. Many children are obliged to leave school at an early age to earn their daily bread. Practically, all finish their school training by the time that manhood has begun to dawn. The principles of Christian faith, of manly honor, of true virtue remain in their hearts. But the hottest iron cools rapidly when exposed to frosty air. And in the same way human hearts grow cold; they lose the principles which made them warm when exposed to the icy blast of the bad, scoffing, jeering world. We must look then for something to supplement the school house, to continue, to perfect and to preserve its work.

Will purely religious Sodalities supply this want? Can you imagine a conflagration going on at the top of a quite high building, and the firemen laboring most devotedly to extinguish the flames with a stream of water which falls just short of where the fire is raging? The stream is not by any means useless. It does much good. It dampens the parts of the building it is able to reach, and prevents them from being, later on, destroyed. But it never can extinguish the fire. The writer has the greatest possible respect for purely religious Sodalities. He has established them, and cultivated them with the utmost care. They preserve in innocence and uprightness of heart all who join and remain faithful to them. But he cannot help feeling that their operation is much like that of the stream of water which does not reach the place of the fire. The great majority will not join them. And the great majority are those among whom the conflagration is raging, those whom we wish to reach, those whom we *must* reach if we desire to do our duty thoroughly. Consequently, we must look further for our remedy.

Will Temperance Societies do the work? Who does not know the evils wrought by drink? It is the most dangerous of all temptations to our young men. The greater part of our crime and nearly all our *abject* poverty come directly or indirectly from drunkenness. If you desire any proof as regards the crime, you need but scan carefully the terrible records to be found in any of our daily newspapers, reading between the lines, to get at the causes of things. Should you have any doubts regarding the poverty, consult any practical member of our St. Vincent de Paul Societies. They will tell you of the blighted lives, the broken hearts, the wrecked careers, the tear-stained eyes, the souls lost to country, Church, Heaven and God, through the instrumentality of this dreadful demon, which they have met in the course of their ministrations of mercy. This does not mean that the widow and the orphan who are thrown upon the charity of the world for support have been slaves of drink themselves. But it means, oh, so often, that they were brought to misery and to want by the drunken habits of

the husband, father, brother or son, who otherwise would have been their mainstay and support.

There is no man of right mind or disposition who would not readily and willingly do everything in his power to put an end to this great evil. The Temperance Societies have done very much in this direction. They are worthy of all the encouragement they can possibly receive. Their organizers are men of intelligence, self-sacrifice and zeal. Nevertheless, here again we meet the former difficulty. Viewing the effect of their work from its present condition, and from the experience of the past, we know that an extremely large number can never be induced to join them. Consequently, we must look elsewhere again for the remedy we are seeking.

What then is this remedy? It is the establishment, wherever practicable, of associations for the young men in which the rising generation will be supplied with all lawful and innocent amusements, and to which they will be positively attracted by the pleasure in them to be found; in which they can, if so disposed, improve their education; where they may be bound together socially, that they may know, respect, love and assist one another; where the pastor of the church or his delegated assistant will visit them regularly, thus attaching them to the Church and to the priests, keeping them regular in their attendance at Mass and the Sacraments, saving them from the street, the saloon and the dive.

The theory is certainly most beautiful. Could its results be made to equal its capabilities and its *prima facie* promises, it would, in a single generation, produce fruit that would make the Catholic Church in the United States the wonder and the admiration of the world. Let us see what it has accomplished thus far.

It is now probably more than forty years since the idea of the young men's societies was first broached in this country. The writer does not know and has not been able to ascertain the name of its first projector. But certainly among its earliest propagators were Mgr. Doane, of Newark, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. McQuade, then also of New Jersey, and now the Rt. Reverend Bishop of Rochester, New York. The pioneer founders were wonderfully enthusiastic. The logic of the situation was so clear that they felt as though they had struck a spiritual gold mine. The results did not always equal their expectations. The young men were often found phlegmatic, indisposed to work, and easily tempted to overstep the rules which the pastor felt himself called upon to make for the prevention of abuses. More than a few of the associations collapsed within some years after their establishment. And it happened sometimes that those who had been the most enthusiastic supporters of the idea lost heart, coming to the conclusion that the young

men as a body were a set upon whom the labor was wasted, and that the plan of improving them by means of the societies was nothing but an idle, even if beautiful, dream. Nevertheless, the idea would not down. A good and practical idea is immortal. It may undergo modifications. It may change very much in form. It may seem at times to be weak and drooping. But death comes to it never.

As old supporters fell off new ones took their places. Besides, many societies lived and flourished from the very beginning. Were there not danger of making invidious distinctions through the mentioning of names, it would be easy to cite here many instances of organizations that have gone on improving from the very day of their birth. Moreover, people began to see that where failure did come, the causes were always traceable and avoidable by those who cared to learn. Sometimes it was the fault of the young men. Other times it was the fault of the Spiritual Director. In other cases it was shared by both. But in no case was the fault intentional. *Mistake* would be the word rather than *fault*. And the foundation reason for the mistakes was that neither party thoroughly understood the other. But as a better understanding began to grow, so did the societies increase, not only in numbers, but also in utility. Besides, the associations were always poor financially. The word poverty is a term very often misapplied. It is hard to see that the millionaire is more really wealthy than the laboring man, provided the latter have plenty of work, with reasonable pay therefor, and sufficient means to clothe, house and feed himself and his family. Indeed, add contentment to the laborer's life and you make him, in thousands of instances, by far the wealthier man of the two. But poverty, real poverty, downright want is a very evil thing to bear. Often does it freeze the love even of husband and wife, of parent and of child. And the societies in the beginning were almost invariably *poor*. They lacked what they *should* have had. Meant to attract the young men, there was no real attraction for them. No wonder that the members were often phlegmatic, fell away from attendance at meetings, urged sometimes improvements which there were no means for supplying, and thus gradually brought disaster to the organizations. Nor need we be surprised that the societies were poor at the time. Our people were nearly all poor. They had not yet built their churches, nor their schools, nor their seminaries. They had neither money nor attention to bestow upon this new work. But lately all this has begun to change. Time has done much to bring about an improvement. Much has been accomplished also through the better social and financial standing of our people. And great have been the results brought about by the constant efforts of the

Diocesan and National Unions, of which we shall say more later on, At the present time there are in the city of New York alone fully fifty of these societies, every one of them reasonably prosperous; some largely so. Chicago, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, Baltimore, Washington, St. Louis, New Orleans, Newark, San Francisco, Boston, Scranton, Albany, Syracuse, Buffalo, Cleveland, Harrisburg, in fact all the large cities of the country are proportionally well supplied. And of these societies some have reached the very ideal of their development and prosperity. They have equipment which is absolutely complete. They possess large, beautiful houses, which it is a pleasure and an education to enter. They have libraries, gymnasiums, billiards, game-rooms, bowling-alleys, in fact everything that can delight the heart of the average young man. Their membership also is very large and constantly increasing. Societies such as these would have been an utter impossibility twenty years ago, or even ten years ago. The fact that some have come to this point of prosperity and success is an evidence that others can reach the same with time and effort. What then can we hope for the future?

Granted the necessity and feasibility of these societies, the first thing necessary is to spread as widely as possible all the information regarding them we can gather. If, as the believers in the movement claim, and as seems to be proven, this be a work of really great importance, it should be universally recognized as such. Next we need to have a high ambition. This does not mean that we must start in every instance at the top of the ladder. The beginning may be as humble as you please, provided a number of brave, intelligent hearts be among those who commence, and the ideal be always kept in mind. As a rule, it is probably better to begin humbly and to climb upward. Very likely the ideal society would be one like this. The organization should be as large as possible in numbers. Its rules should be wide enough to admit all the Catholic young men of respectability. It should have a good-sized building, equipped with all the appurtenances of a club for social and athletic purposes. This means parlors, reading-rooms, library, gymnasium, cinder path, baths, games and billiards. No effort should be spared to make laymen of age, of wealth, and of influence take an interest and become at least honorary members. In many cases an excellent Board of Governors can be chosen from men of this class. This will give them a share in the responsibility of the work, and cause them to help it not only with the fruits of their experience, but also with material means. If you want a proof of the advantage of this portion of the plan, you have only to take a lesson from the associations for young men founded by those who are not of the Catholic faith. You can scarcely find a city of any

importance throughout the length and breadth of the land, in which these societies have not been established by non-Catholics. They have magnificent buildings, sometimes many of them in the same city. Did any one ever know a single one of these buildings to be either erected or managed by the young men themselves? To my mind the obtaining of this interest and co-operation from those who are in a position to give it, is the essential point, not of the beginning, but of the completion and the perfection of the work for the young men. One thing more is required in this ideal society. That is the Spiritual Director. I will not say that he must be a priest of piety, devotion and zeal. These qualities are supposed in every priest. But he needs to love the work, to give it great attention, to be patient, tactical, perfectly tempered. If he can be one who can delight in the company of the young men; who can learn to know them all; who is able to comfort them in their sorrows and to aid them in their difficulties, then you have the perfect Spiritual Director. Many such exist now, and are working earnestly. All can learn. And who knows but that, in the not very far future, lectures may be given to the candidates for the priesthood in our seminaries, on the ways and means of dealing with young men, just as they are given at the present time on the management and erection of both day and Sunday schools.

THE NATIONAL UNION.

The great efficient arm for the propagation and the development of this work is the Catholic Young Men's National Union. What is the National Union? It is a Congress of delegates from all the societies throughout the country, that choose to be represented, which holds a convention every year. The objects of the Union and of its conventions are simply and only to assert as loudly as possible the necessity of the societies; to make a manifest of the work done during the year in all the different localities; and to recommend the best plans that can be suggested to those who are willing to accept them. During the year the various officers and committees do all in their power for the prosecution of the plans suggested and approved at the annual gathering. Papers are issued fortnightly in all the societies, on topics that can be of interest and utility to the young men. The last convention was held in Philadelphia in October, 1891, and a glorious gathering it was. With all respect, it can be said that the Catholic Congress in Baltimore in 1889 was not more purely Catholic; the Congress of the United States is not more truly American. Every time one of these assemblies takes place a large number of new societies are formed, new efforts are made everywhere, and great improvement takes place in the associations that already exist. But the Union

wants all the strength it can get. It needs the societies which are prosperous, that they may teach the others. It needs those that are still struggling, that they may learn from the triumphs of their brethren. One hundred and fifty societies were represented at Philadelphia last year. That number should be at least doubled by the time of the next convention, at Albany, in the fall of '92, and this doubled again by the time the World's Fair shall have come. Why is this strength needed? That all may have the results of the widest experience, through the friction of brains and the interchange of opinions. That there may be many to do the work, and that reasonable financial means may be provided for its carrying out. For example, the National Union should have a monthly newspaper not interfering in any way with the work or the privileges of the other most estimable Catholic journals already in existence, but devoted entirely to the interests of the young men's movement. It should have many able writers, and a first-class editor. But any one can see that until such a time as the Union becomes very widespread and is certain of support in the most experienced, influential quarters, such an enterprise as this cannot have great success.

DIOCESAN UNIONS.

Another great help to the Societies, and indeed, the chief means whereby the work of the National Union can be properly carried out, is the establishment of local Unions of Societies in each diocese. Their foundation and management are very simple. Each society elects five delegates. These meet and draw up a constitution. This constitution provides for the officers, the time of meeting, the business to be transacted at the meetings and the means whereby the Union shall seek to increase the number and the prosperity of the societies. The bishop names the president. This officer can be either priest or layman as may be judged the more advisable. Soon a convention of all the young men belonging to the different societies is held. Next, contests of different kinds are instituted, first in athletics, and later on in intellectual matters as well. Recommendations of the National Union are ratified and urged. The meetings of the Diocesan Union are held every month. The greatest stress should be laid upon regular attendance. And the most important point of all is to secure the presence of the Spiritual Directors.

HOW TO INSTITUTE SOCIETIES.

Nothing has been said thus far, about the first establishment of the parochial societies. This also is very simple. The plan here proposed is only one of many, equally efficacious. The pas-

tor announces his intention to form such an organization, some Sunday, at all the Masses. He explains the importance of the work and its productiveness. He urges the young men to attend the first meeting, the date of which he designates. And he asks the parents to push to attendance those who might naturally be inclined to stay away. A meeting is held, officers elected and a Constitution framed. Any one who might feel at sea regarding the form the Constitution should take can at once obtain a copy of an excellent model Constitution by writing to Mr. Charles A. Webber, Secretary, 66 Court Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. A small house is hired, to begin with, or if a whole house cannot be obtained, a certain portion of one. Practical Catholicity is made the essential point for membership. Soon the tastes of the young men begin to manifest themselves. Some take a fancy to athletics, others to reading and literary work, others again to quiet games of different kinds. Materials to suit all these tastes can gradually be introduced. Should the taste be too extravagant or of too peculiar a nature for the whole society to bear the burden, clubs can be formed among such members as desire to follow a particular line and they can bear their own expenses on this point. For example, in the most prosperous society in the city of New York, there are a boating club, a chess club, and a base-ball club, each one having freedom of action and government in itself. Each is, nevertheless, a portion of the general society, and disturbs in no way those whose tastes do not run in these directions. Literary work should be encouraged very much, but rarely compelled. Intoxicating drink, it seems, in every shape and form, should always be excluded. Games of all kinds can be permitted, except those whose principal pleasure comes from gambling, or which have the tendency to so engross the attention of people as to keep them up late at night.

This is all that need be said upon the subject. It is a great work, and one that has come to stay. It is certain to have a very great extension and development. It may reach a strength far beyond what we now even dare to dream. In presenting these few suggestions, the writer is keenly alive to the fact that they are both crude and imperfect. Some years ago he had the pleasure of visiting one of the largest and most important cotton mills in New England. Thousands of hands were busy with the work. Thousands of looms were in operation, producing cloth enough, one would think, to clothe the world. A person in the party asked him the question, "Who invented these looms?" And with the question came up a vision of thousands of talented brains, each of which had contributed its quota of improvement to these looms and then died unknown, like the insects who give first their labor and next their bones to form our famous coral reefs. No

man invented these looms. Thousands of *men* had part in their invention. So will it be with our Young Men's Societies. We will do our share. Others will come after us doing more and better work. But this much is sure, that if a great many become now interested; if our bishops and our pastors and our laymen of distinction will take this work deeply to heart; if they are willing to add something to the burden they are already bearing, there can be no question that in our own generation we will see an extension and an improvement on this point which will not only give us the finest set of Catholic young men the world has ever seen, but perhaps enable us to build up the Church so strongly that we will be able to avoid the disasters she has met with in other centuries and in other climes.

The essential points are first, to believe in the work; second, to have a high ambition regarding it; third, to aid your home organization in every way you can; fourth, to encourage, to assist and to join the National and the Diocesan Unions.

MICHAEL J. LAVELLE.

NEW FORMS OF OLD ERRORS.

TRUTH and error are both subject to development. The difference is, that truth is always consistent with itself, whereas error is naturally self-contradictory. For example: Protestant development is only a multiplying of changes, each of which is the negation of some previous one, or destined to be negatived by some successor. Since Bossuet wrote his "Variations," there have been more new protestantisms born into the world than there could be pulpits for the fulmination of their oddities. Take the last forty years; think of Great Britain only; trace what may be called the genera of the plant Heresy through their infinitely multiplying, crossing, commingling species; if Bossuet could have compressed them into a last chapter, his work would have been at least twice as wonderful. But not only the species, even the genera of the plant Heresy have multiplied seven fold since Bossuet's day. New principles, new ambitions, new methods of reasoning have come into fashion in the last half century. The later issues of Protestantism have been bewildering to all Christians, from their conflict both with one another and with their own selves. They seem to defy both analysis and correlation. They are like the four winds trying to blow together from the same quarter.

How shall we attempt to state these later issues in correct form? It is useless to write discursively on such novelties; the point is, what have been their principles, their postulates, assuming by courtesy that they could be said to have any? Thus, may it be permissible to say of Ritualism, that it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the combination of authority with private judgment? It may be objected by the Ritualists that this is really to beg the question, whether the *reductio ad absurdum* has been reached. Let us say, then, that the Ritualist principle was to combine two contradictions, while the postulate was that the combination would be practicable; the issue being that experience has proved the fatuity of an experiment, which, at the first, was thought to propose a legitimate compromise. Yet this again will be called a loose statement by the Ritualists. They will reply to us that they did not combine two contradictions; all that they did was to shift authority on to the first few general councils, and to leave each man to adopt his "reading" of their teaching. Let this be so; and we have still to ask them, on whose authority they determine that one council was more authoritative than another council; that the Council of Jerusalem had more authority than that

of Trent, or that of Ephesus than of the very last Vatican Council? Correct form would demand that, on the elementary question of authority, there should be laid down such perfectly definite essentials, that any child, learning his catechism, should be able to see, as the wisest doctor, why this council was infallible, that not. No such accuracy could be gravely attempted by any Ritualist. The most that could be hazarded would be that the Church *was* infallible, but from causes external or internal became fallible; and that therefore the only safe way was to distrust all living authority and to fall back on church authority before it died. We should, of course, have to reply to such an hypothesis: How was it possible that a divine authority could die? Who had power to kill the divine commission to the Church? Or, who possessed that personal, that novel gift of infallibility, which enabled him to affirm that, say, on the 25th day of March, in the year of our Lord 524, at exactly three and a quarter minutes past four in the afternoon, infallibility was suddenly transferred from the Catholic Church to some authority whom it might not be discreet to venture to name, but who, as we all know, in moments of candor, could be none other than each man's own self, the sovereign interpreter of both the Church and the Bible? No: definition is quite impossible to all Protestants. For, as with the Ritualists, so with Dry Churchmen or Slow Churchmen (to adopt the divisions given by Mr. Conybeare in the Edinburgh *Review*), with Low Churchmen or Broad Churchmen, with Anglican or Associationist clergymen, there is the confessed inability to define their positions in such terms as could convey a fixed meaning to all the world. So that when we attempt to write on Protestant development, we have to face the initial difficulty: "How is it possible to define the new forms of old errors?" a task from which we at once shrink in despair, since no Protestant will so much as hear of definition. "General description" is as much as we can safely dare to attempt; and even here, as Cardinal Newman said, "generalities are apt to be unjust to individuals." Still, a few facts as to Protestant development in the last forty years may be enumerated with fair justice to all concerned.

Let the inquiry be confined to Great Britain; an ample field for all experiments in Protestantism. To appreciate the novelties we must remember the antiquities, and the course of events which has led up to present thinkings. Broadly, may it be said that the last forty years have been a test-time, and that we are now witnessing the results of the experiments. But how came it that any experiments could be needed? Nearly three hundred years had tested Protestantism, before any one of the (three) new experiments was essayed; first, the experiment of combining Catho-

licity with Protestantism ; next, the experiment of ousting Protestantism from the Church of England ; and, thirdly, the experiment of ousting both Protestantism and Catholic communion from the idea, though not from the life, of the new religion. That "idea" may perhaps be sketched, historically, in the following way : Puseyism was the beginning, and a profoundly earnest beginning, of what may be called, and with some exactness, "the combination theory." A certain amount of Protestantism, with a certain amount of Catholicity, were to be mixed in very carefully weighed proportions. Dr. Pusey was the great man for holding the scales. But the theory was soon proved to be unworkable, and it was decided that the element, Protestantism, must go. Now came the tussle, how to naturalize Catholicity in an institution which was out of communion with the Roman Church. Protestantism had been abandoned, as a back-bone; Catholicity was found impracticable in any sense that could be more real than that of appropriating a few selected Roman doctrines ; the Roman Church, and also the Greek schism, disowned fellowship ; what was to be done to keep up the fiction of Catholicity in a church which seemed to have no ancestors and no relations ? "We *won't* submit to the Roman Church," said the Ritualists ; "we *can't* submit to the Greek Church, which does not want us ; we have disowned our Protestant ancestry and the Reformers, as being all in the wrong in a dozen senses, a dozen grooves ; here we are, positively alone in our insularity, yet confident of our being the typically right thing. Only one chance remains to us, which is to condemn the Roman Church as being out of communion with the Anglican idea—the only pure idea ; and though, in fact, we shall be neither Protestant nor Catholic, still in idea we shall be *the Catholic Church*."

So the Roman Church was once more ostracised from Anglican sympathies, by the very men who had but just ostracised "the Protestant religion;" the school of Dr. Littledale being as Protestant in disposition as was the school of John Knox or Martin Luther. Thus the "idea"—we should never dream of saying the reality, for the majority of Anglicans have been much too earnest to believe in nonsense—of the latest development of extreme High Churchism in Great Britain was to oust both Catholic communion and Protestantism from the now resuscitated "Early Anglican Church"; a delusive theory being thus substituted for a national loss ; a fictitious idea being put in the place of historic truth. Happily non-Catholics are always and everywhere inconsistent, so that the new theorists have been in heart quite a different sort of believers to what their text-books would have led outsiders to suppose.

The other two great parties in the Establishment, the Broad-Churchmen and the old fashioned Low-Churchmen, have also been

developing new "ideas." Broad-Churchmen have taken skepticism within their range, not as an evil to be professed, but to be condoned; while many Low-Churchmen have ingrafted religious liberalism upon their old faith, in a sort of kindly, gentlemanly spirit of magnanimity. The points of contact between Broad-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen are, in these days, almost too fine to be discerned. In England, a Broad-Churchman is a man who affects "scientism," and also a calm and speculative estimate of things in general, together with an amiable impression that Christianity is a good religion, provided you care more for its morals than for its dogmas. He is perhaps a free-thinker first, and a Christian afterwards, though education and the national sentiment preserve his "faith." Forty years ago, he was an easy-thinking Christian, who objected only to Roman Catholicism and to skepticism; to-day, he will include both extremes in his forgiveness, provided there be no aggressiveness nor bigotry. In consistency, every Anglican should be a Broad-Churchman, because the principle of private judgment approves breadth. Indeed, forty years ago, most Churchmen were Broad-Churchmen. But the old form of Anglican breadth meant no more than a comprehending of all the Anglican schools of thought in "Christian charity"; the generously believing that the one thing needful was to be a Protestant, though as to the particular groove or leaning, it did not matter. The new form of breadth goes outside Protestantism. Indeed, it would be impossible to limit the range of its cold embrace. And the explanation of the great change is as follows: It must be remembered that the Broad-Churchman of forty years ago was innocent of three experiences of the present time. First, Ritualism, or the principle of Church authority, had not been worked out to its ultimate right or wrong; next, Biblical criticism, with its ally "infidel science" (perhaps a conjunction of words not more inaccurate than "scientific infidelity," which sounds not unlike "rational imbecility," or "divinely assured atheism," or any other odd compound of contradictions), had not been patronized by newspapers, or gently treated by philosophers, who made use of them as a pretext for infidelity; and thirdly, the visible action of the Catholic Church in England was scarcely begun, still less conspicuously dominant throughout the country. These three "experiences" now cause the Broad-Churchman to adopt attitudes which never even so much as occurred to him forty years ago. He sees that Ritualism is but the grave toy of earnest speculators; he sees that the Old Testament, perhaps the New—on which, formerly, he pinned his whole faith—are subjected to criticisms which deeply disturb his old confidence; while, in the exact proportion in which he resists the Catholic claims, he is thrown back upon himself for

all his religion. Thus, his "new form" is much worse than his "old form," for while he knows that he cannot be taught safely by the Church of England, and while he is a good deal shaken by the new onslaught on his old evidences, he is driven back upon his own self, by refusing to "hear the Church," which, forty years ago, only spoke to him from foreign countries.

If the Broad-Churchman be broader, is the Protestant churchman more protesting; does he repudiate "Roman corruptions" more assiduously? Now, here we have a difficult question to answer. The "new form" is necessarily quite distinct from the "old form." The old form (with Low-Churchmen) was the protesting against a religion which was grossly travestied by all Protestant authors and clergymen; the new form is the protesting against a religion which has been sufficiently explained by living compatriots and distinguished converts. The old form was the protesting only against "Romanism"—a slang word which did duty for the Catholic religion, for all that was supposed to be either its history or its teaching; the new form is the protesting equally against the new religions *within* the Establishment, and that One Religion which has been unchanged since the day of Pentecost. The old form was based on the assumption that the Bible was delivered, printed and bound, to the clergy and laity of the first century of the Christian Church, but was subsequently locked up in an iron safe by wicked Papists, until Martin Luther got the key and astonished the world; the new form is based on the assumption that, though there could be no such thing as a printed Bible for fifteen centuries, and, consequently, there could be no such thing as "keeping the Bible back from the people," still, the Catholic Church had not the guidance of the Holy Spirit—as every Protestant has had since the blessed Reformation—to rightly interpret the Sacred Manuscripts. Obviously, these three changes of the Protestant attitude must suffice to establish a "new form." The old form was (1) ignorance of Catholic truth; (2) a sort of universality of hatred of Popery by *all* Protestants; and (3) a firm belief that a Bible, which took a man's whole life to copy, *ought* to have been in the possession of every Christian, but was not because Catholic priests would not allow it. The new form, on the contrary (1) has to coexist with an adequate knowledge of Catholic history, tradition, doctrine, devotion; (2) has to co-exist with the "rank Popery" of half its disciples within the citadel of its own stoutest anti-Catholicism; and (3) has to confess that learned converts, scores of clergy, saintly laymen, now interpret the Protestant Bible in the Roman Catholic sense, while the "Protestant" persists in interpreting it for himself.

Naturally this new form has given birth to modes of attack
VOL. XVII.—8

which, under the old form, would have had no reason of being. We will first speak of the mode of attack by "Associations." Now the chief of these is called "The Church Association," which was founded twenty-six years ago, as "the last bulwark against Rome within the Church of England," and of which the "Prospectus" stated that it was initiated because the Society of the Holy Cross, the English Church Union, and other Ritualistic societies have been working secretly for upwards of twenty years to introduce into our church and country the Romish Mass and auricular confession." This institution (it will be needless to name others of a similar purpose) has been making war on its brother Anglicans for a quarter of a century, and is now, perhaps, more pugnacious than it has ever been. To give an idea of its "work," it boasted only a few weeks ago, that "under the advice of its lawyer, the Council instituted a second suit, in order to bring before the House of Lords the evidence that idolatrous worship had, *in fact*, been publicly paid before the graven images set up in St. Paul's Cathedral." Now, the comicality of accusing the amiable and accomplished clergymen who conduct the services in the metropolitan Cathedral of Anglicanism, of "*in fact* committing idolatry before graven images" is only equalled by the sectarian pique which such an accusation must demonstrate, or by the sense of failure which such Protestant slanders must imply. Here we have a Protestant association, which not only says that the better part of the Anglican clergy have gone back to Catholic belief, Catholic worship, but have receded even into the paganism of the pre-Christian era to the extent of worshiping stocks and stones in place of God. What a plain proof that there must be a new form of Protestantism, which has absolutely nothing in common with the old form! But take the Anglican Associations of the *new* form, and see whether they do not justify the assertion that there are now two exactly opposite Protestantisms within one Church. The "Society of the Holy Cross," a High Church society, is so bent on a return to the old paths, that it would "pray for union with the Roman Church, so as to put an end to the grievous scandal of divisions." The "English Church Union" would work chiefly "for the restoration of the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood." While other High Church associations would make "the reunion of Christendom to be the first prayerful longing for all Catholic souls"; or would regard "the full teaching of Catholic doctrine as the prime requisite." Now, it must be obvious that the aspiration of the High Church societies is much more Christian than is the dull bitterness of their opponents; still, *both* are aspirations of English Churchmen, *both* are permitted to have their way within the Establishment. But the point which we must now insist on as being so instructive as to

"new form," is, that the Low Church (not the High Church) leagues, unions, associations are meant to be substitutes for the living authority of Church-of-Englandism; they are not put forward as auxiliary to episcopal authority (indeed, the bishops have not formally sanctioned any one of them), but as assuming to teach bishops and priests what pure Anglicanism is or ought to be, and so to enforce their Associationist views on the nation. This "new form" of Protestantism is like civil war. Within the ramparts of the Anglican Communion various regiments are privately formed, whose duty it is to dictate to the commander, the officers, and the entire army how they should act in regard to an enemy and to one another; and who are in open hostility to half the army on every point of military discipline, as much as on the science of attack or of defence. It is, perhaps, the drollest form of church-mutiny yet perpetrated. And to give a broader touch of comedy to such church-mutiny, the Church Association has recently issued a circular to the entire nation, in which it reproached both Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury for appointing too many High Church clergymen to Anglican bishoprics. Mr. Gladstone, it seems, has named fourteen, and Lord Salisbury eleven Ritualists, to be teachers of the painfully divided State Church; whereas the same statesmen have only named seven or eight Low Church clergymen to the equivocal position of spiritually fighting with their compeers. The Church Association therefore calls upon all British electors to return only Low Church representatives to the next Parliament; so that Parliament may control the Ministers, and the Ministers may control the Bishops, and the Bishops may teach in harmony with "The Association." It is needless to pursue this trifling to its grave issue, yet it was relevant to our inquiry into "new forms" to show that the modern invention of Associations is new in tactics, new in combativeness, new in schism; just as it is a new usurping of the teaching authority of the Church, which was never before supposed to rest exclusively with Associations.

Another new form which is perhaps kindred in principle, though it is much grander and graver in aspiration, is the tendency of all Protestant bodies to extend themselves by "co-operation," as a sort of homage to the unattainable virtue of "unity." We take up the newspapers day by day, and are sure to read such captivating headings as "The Church Congress," "The National Protestant Congress," "The International Conference"; the Dissenting, like the Anglican, Protestants emulating Catholic unity by such adjectives as oecumenical or universal; and their boast being that their union is Catholic, in the sense that they all happily agree to differ. The last Archbishop of Canterbury may be said to have started this novelty by convoking his Pan-Anglican Synod at Lam-

beth. And in the present year, 1891, we have had the glorification of the principle of "co-operation" by the speakers at the annual Anglican Church Congress. The Congress was held in Wales in the month of September, in the hope of attracting the Welsh Dissenters to the Church of England; an invitation to "co-operation" being warmly urged, as antecedent to closer ties of corporate unity. It may be useful to study the language of some of the speakers, as showing at least the sentiment, if not the principle, of co-operation. Thus, the late Dean of St. Asaph's told his brother dignitaries at the Congress that "Reunion, at least in the near future, was the vainest of dreams." And he added that "it was useless to talk about the sin of schism. Of course schism was a sin, when a man deliberately, for private and selfish ends, or out of pure arrogance and self-conceit, rent the unity of the Christian Church. Churchmen accepted the voice of the visible Church, as representing in the main the voice of God, but the Nonconformists honestly rejected that view. Still, he did not despair of reunion; but that state of things could not be hastened; and therefore they should turn their attention to co-operation." Such cautious phrasing, if converted into rough English, might mean, "doctrinal unity among Protestants is impossible, whether inside or outside the State Church; still, as it would look better, and it would be more convenient, to work together for material ends, let us see if we cannot co-operate in conventional sense, just as the various cliques in a town or parish meet in a vestry-room to co-operate about coal or blankets for the poor." Another speaker at the Church Congress thought it might be "desirable to invite Dissenters to occupy the pulpits of the Church of England;" but the Archbishop of York considered this plan to be too radical; "though it might be desirable to attract Dissenters by simpler and more cheerful services in the National Church, services more after the pattern of *their own*." The Bishop of Manchester, with characteristic ambiguity, thought that Nonconformists "should remember how on the one hand the Scriptural definiteness of the formularies of the National Church had formed a pillar of strength for Christian truth in critical times, while, on the other hand, the Catholic freedom of their authorized interpretation had availed more than once to hold in touch, and ultimately to call back into Christian communion many who seemed ready to break away into open apostacy."

After this episcopal eulogium on "Catholic freedom," a Welsh clergyman, laughing to scorn all such attempts at coqueting with the four great divisions of the Welsh Dissent, declared honestly that Welsh Dissenters detested the National Church, and would co-operate heartily in any scheme for its destruction; a statement

which seems to have had some truth in it from the admitted fact that most Dissenters like quarrelling; a prominent Baptist, the Rev. Iwan Jenkyn, having read a paper a few weeks ago at a Baptists' Association, in which he said that "the various sections of Nonconformity acted towards each other like dogs fighting over a bone, although they strongly urged each other to fight Episcopalianism."

These few quotations will suffice to show that "co-operation" between Nonconformists, or co-operation between Nonconformists and English Churchmen, is almost as hopeless as is unity. Yet the point is that *some* Protestants desire *some* co-operation; and we may regard this as a new form of an old error; since the old error was that Protestant sectaries should agree to differ, not that they should think it a good thing to strive to combine. As a matter of fact the modern relations of the Church of England and Nonconformity are so different from the old relations as to be quite new; the new Anglicanism being a much wider departure from the old Anglicanism than was Nonconformity from the Anglicanism of, say, John Wesley. So that if Nonconformity is now invited to co-operate with Anglicanism, it may well reply, "with which of the Anglican churches are we to co-operate? We know what we *left* a hundred years ago, but we now see a perfectly new Church of England. Do you invite us to co-operate with the Church of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who told his clergy in a recent pastoral, 'not to make any changes in their conduct of Divine Service, unless they were assured of the practical unanimity of their people in desiring such change'; and that even if they ordinarily held services which implied a belief in Holy Mass, they should sometimes, 'especially on the first Sunday of the month,' have a Low Church form of service, 'which should meet in all ways the desire of their parishioners'; or do you invite us to co-operate with the new Church of the Ritualists, who write to their newspapers about their High Mass and their Low Mass, their Missa Cantata, their Children's Mass, and their Choral Mass, and also pretend to be Roman Catholics in everything but obedience—that one dogma which they protest against as not being primitive?" It certainly seems unreasonable to say to Nonconformists, "co-operate with your Mother Church, the Church of England"; while yet not specifying which of the Churches is referred to; whether the Church of the pliable Archbishop of Canterbury or that of the "persecuted" Bishop of Lincoln. "Co-operate among yourselves" would be a reasonable rejoinder; "and then ask us to co-operate with you." Briefly—for we must leave this point and pass on to others—what co-operation can there be between the Ritualists, who affirm, through their favorite organ

The Church Times, "the Mass should regain the position which it once occupied in the Church of England, and which it still preserves in every other branch of historic Christendom, Latin or oriental"; and (say, for example) the delegates to the International Council of Congregationalists (held last summer), one of whom said at the council, "*our* council, compared with the twenty oecumenical councils of the Roman and the fifty small councils of the Anglican Church, has loftier aims; for, we are met together, *not* to frame theological definitions, but to deal with the great pressing questions of"—housing the poor, equalizing the claims of capital and labor, and making life more moral and more honorable.

A writer in the English *Quarterly* for last October, in the course of an able and just article on "Church Progress and Church Defence," laid stress on the vast practical fruits of Anglican industries, in education, in mission-work, in domestic blessings to the poor, in social harmonies, and in material structures both for worship and for charities. Every one of these boasts was well-founded. The Church of England has done full justice to its capacities, while its lay members have done full justice to the clergy. The liberality of the lay members is sufficiently shown in the fact that within a period of a quarter of a century—1860 to 1884—the voluntary lay contributions have exceeded four hundred million dollars; reckoning only such contributions as have been made public. Energy of will and action have kept pace with the High Church growth, as well as with the collateral spread of latitudinarianism.

But our point is, what is the difference between this new energy and the energy which was almost national for three centuries? The answer is found in the very title of the article which records the luxuriant fruits of modern Anglicism—"Church Progress and Church *Defence*." Why defence? How many enemies has the National Church to face that it should want defending? Three in chief, which are all new within forty years: (1) The enemy of extreme Ritualism, which is leading the nation to an apprehension of the incompatibility of Anglicanism with Authority; (2) the enemy of Freethinking, which has now shot far beyond Protestant liberty, so that it assumes the liberty of saying, "I do not believe in the supernatural"; and (3) the enemy (so accounted) of Catholicity, which is now housed in almost every part of Great Britain, so that its hierarchy takes equal place with that of Anglicanism. Church defence! To fall back on our old simile, let us suppose a besieged fortress, in which the danger is from one enemy on the outside, and from two enemies who are fighting desperately on the inside. The general in command has to give two-thirds of his consideration to the question of defence against his *inside* enemies;

while, to make matters worse, one of these two enemies is on terms of parley with the "common enemy" who is on the outside of the fortress. And, unhappily, the poor general (say, the Archbishop of Canterbury) has to receive his orders from the home authorities, who are only civilians, and who forbid him to cashier or turn out of the fortress any rebel of either of the sections, who are laughing at him. "Church defence," in such a plight, comes to mean the equally defending the rights of both the belligerents, who are fighting within the fortress; together with the right of the party, Ritualism, to make terms with the common enemy—to even refuse to strike a blow, save in mere pretence. The defence, therefore, is too great a difficulty for the commander. To defend his fortress against an outside enemy would be one thing, but to defend it against two inside enemies is another thing. He must be tempted to wish that the two Anglican parties would consume each other, as the only practical solution of a "Church Defence" in which each party defends itself against the other party.

We know, of course, that church defence means, with the "State and Church party," the preventing the disestablishing of the state church; and here, again, we have a new form of an old error which will want a little formulating to make it clear. The old idea was, that Church and State were united, but only in the sense that the State aided the Church by throwing over her the mantle of its patronage; not in the sense that (1) the State controlled the Church, or that (2) the Church controlled the State by teaching it truth. In the last forty years, two new "views" have sprung up; (1) that the State ought to rule the Church on points of orthodoxy; (2) that the Church should resist enforcement by the State. The first view is maintained by those who rejoice when the Privy Council says Placet or Non-placet in a doctrinal dispute. The second view is maintained by those who rejoice in "suffering persecution" rather than yield an inch to the "vile Erastianism" of State judgments. Now, both these views have sprung out of the novelties of High Churchism; and both are, curiously enough, both right and wrong. That the State should rule the Church would be obviously wrong in a Catholic sense, because the State knows nothing whatever about orthodoxy, save only that the Catholic Church teaches it; but, as the State was the original parent of the Church of England, it is obvious that it must have parental rights of enforcing homage. So, too, that the Church should resist the ruling of the State would be right, in regard to doctrines, on the part of Catholics; but, on the part of Anglicans, one does not see how they can affect to resist the State, since they admit that Henry VIII., Queen Elizabeth, or their parliaments, played any tricks they liked with Catholic doctrines,

while repudiating Catholic authority altogether. Thus, the novelty of the modern controversy is, that both sides may be said to be right, while both sides may be also said to be wrong; the special conditions of the Church of England being so confusing of fact with theory that Church Defence means really defence of your own ideas.

The slow transition from the old forms to the new forms, would need a volume for careful tracing or elucidation. Let one example suffice, and we can conclude. In a country church in the Isle of Wight, fifty-four years ago, there was such a dominance of the "old form" of Protestant Nothingism that half the east end was given up to a communion table, and the other half to a huge pew for the lord of the manor. As soon as Puseyism came into fashion, the lord of the manor was requested to forego his right to divide the holy of holies with Almighty God; and, after six years of contention he did so. Then came open seats where for generations there had been sheep-pens; and High Church doctrines where for generations there had been Protestantism. Slowly, in the course of years, further development took place, until a new vicar, who was transcendental in his Anglicanism, carried his innovations to such extent that he was sternly rebuked for "lighting candles on the altar." Thus, in half a century, the old form of arid Protestantism—which was equally a mockery of the natural fitness of devotional ideas and of the whole supernatural structure of the Christian Church—was transformed into such an imitation of Catholic function that the son of a clergyman who had been wide-famed for his frantic Protestantism became "a martyr" to his practical experiments of the New Popery.

The question which naturally arises is, can a religion be divine which has every feature of the weakest human instability? We have touched cursorily on only a few of the prominent features, so as rather to suggest than to attempt to demonstrate their human origin. Very briefly let us sum up their value—though but suggestively.

If Protestantism had been divine, would it have expanded itself in the way of contradictions; would it not have demonstrated its divine origin by unities? We may use the plural number, unities, because there is a unity which is structural, there is a unity which is doctrinal, and there is a unity which is (as the Dean of St. Asaph's called it) co-operative. Structural unity is unknown to Protestantism; for, in England alone, the Registrar-General counts 206 sects, while, as to the Church of England, even in Lord Macaulay's time, it was "a hundred sects battling within one Church"; and, as has just been shown, the developments of the great contending divisions are in the direction of such "structural" antag-

onism, that the visible Ritualist Church, the visible Broad Church, and the visible Low Church are as distinct in their outward features, as in their purposes. As to doctrinal unity, first, the changes have been continuous, and next, their excesses have been concurrent with the continuity. While as to co-operative unity, it is as impracticable within the Establishment as it is unwished-for by the sects which are outside it.

Where, then, shall we find the evidences of a divine origin? The "new forms" give no more sign of it than did the "old forms." We said at the beginning that the Ritualists claim their new form to be the old form, not of Protestantism but of "the purest Catholicity." Let this be so; still, as such old forms would be *not* Protestant, it would be the ingrafting of what was repudiated at the Reformation into the very Church which the Reformers built for its repudiation. Oh, no, say the Ritualists, the Reformers did not build the Church of England; that Church had become terribly ill and invalidated ("corrupt" is the popular adjective with all Church parties), and was only almost killed by the Protestant Reformers, in order that it might be resuscitated and rejuvenated by the Ritualists. Whence the Ritualists derived the power to work this miracle has never been stated by their great masters of apology. "New forms of old errors" was perfectly natural; but the "rebirth of old truths" which had been dead for centuries (dead as far as all positive teaching was concerned; dead as to the Holy Mass, as to Confession, as to priestly powers) is not natural in any sense which can be called Catholic. For, even assuming that divine truths could die (which they could not do), a divine authority would be required to re-deliver them; and since the so-called Church of England had proved that it was *not* divine, by tumbling into the grossest heresies and profanations, it must be obvious to common sense that so fictitious an institution could not have the power to teach itself all Catholic truth. If, being divine, it could teach itself scores of heresies, the same divinity must teach divers heresies now; or, indeed, to speak plainly, the very use and purpose of its divinity must be to confuse all truth with all error. This may be "Catholic"; but, if so, the structural, doctrinal, and co operative unity, which we assumed to be the divine features of a divine church, must give place to their exact opposites in point of fact.

We need not glance again at the "Protestant" vagaries and Babel tongues. Enough has been said to show that *their* origin is human. While, as to Broad-Churchmen, their theory of comprehensiveness is the assertion of the non-divinity of doctrinal belief. What is left? The Salvation Army, which is the most dogmatic of all Protestantisms—for it positively forbids the introduction

of doctrinal controversy, the General pontifically ruling that there shall be no creeds—has possibly hit upon the right solution of the Protestant muddle by saying that all Protestantism must be protested against. This seems to be the only way of getting out of the embarrassment of having to protest against the whole word, past and present. General Booth has not received the intellectual homage which is his due, as being the first man to rule positively that there are *no* Christian doctrines—beyond, of course, the belief in redemption and in redeeming grace—and that therefore heresy consists in affirming that there *are* doctrines. This is an ultimate which should have been foreseen by Martin Luther, so that he might have lessened the chaos which his illogical mind helped to bequeath.

Is there no further issue for all this Protestantism? Must new forms of old errors continue to be the "Christian" development of all the churches which are outside the Catholic Church? Yes, necessarily. There can be only one of two principles in any kind of religious belief; the natural, which must be subject to fallibility; the supernatural, which is essentially infallible. No need to ask whether Protestantism can be supernatural, since it repudiates infallibility while claiming the right of personal dogmatism; in other words, limits infallibility to one's own self. Is it then only natural? Far from it. For, though its principle as to Church authority is that each man should be his own pontiff, its close neighborhood to the Catholic Church keeps it always in living sympathy with an immense deal that is divine or supernatural. As Cardinal Manning has said, most Englishmen are in heresy, but few are heretics; for the majority are only traditionally deceived by fictional history, by association, by education, or by surroundings, so that the deception is, perhaps, more sentimental than intellectual. "Canterbury" keeps up the fiction of Churchism, or Mr. Spurgeon keeps up the fiction of enthusiasm. So that new forms of old errors seem to Protestants to be little more than the changeful toilet of a sound religion which has worked well. That the Catholic Church never changes, save in that sense of divine vitality which enables her to define *old* truths from time to time in order to meet the new forms of old errors, seems to Protestants to be easily explicable, on the ground that the Catholic principle is: "A definition once promulgated is infallible." But the assurance of this Catholic principle is the assurance that the Holy Spirit necessarily guides the Church into all truth. Protestantism has repudiated that divine principle. Hence, new forms of old errors continue to be the poor substitutes for eternal truths, which may be defined, from age to age, but cannot be changed.

A. F. MARSHALL, B. A. (OXON.).

THE MOSAIC LAW IN THE LIGHT OF ETHICS.

THE legislator of the Pentateuch is concerned only with practical morality. Abstract psychological and ethical speculation is no more to be found in the Pentateuchal law than the theory of numbers in the merchant's ledger. Still the first principles of ethics: God's supreme dominion over man, the liberty of the human will, an unchangeable distinction between good and evil, and the moral imputability of every free action, are everywhere assumed as the foundation of the whole legislation. The contention of Professor Schürer that the Mosaic law destroyed the liberty of will, is as groundless as it is captious. "External constraint is of the essence of law, says Schürer,¹ freedom is of the essence of moral action." The Professor cannot strike everything commanded by law off the catalogue of moral actions. Filial love and parental affection, the religious keeping of the Sabbath, all the innumerable observances prescribed by the laws of civil and social life must in that case disappear from the list of praiseworthy actions. The freedom essential to the morality of an act, is not the freedom from external constraint, but the absence of internal necessity. The suffering of the martyr on the rack and at the stake implies greater external constraint than any Mosaic law ever placed upon its Jewish subject; still the whole world regards the martyr's patience as the greatest triumph of human freedom and of moral virtue. The Mosaic legislation, therefore, needs no ethical vindication against Dr. Schürer's imputation.

Nor is it necessary to defend the Pentateuchal law against the charge that it leads its subjects astray regarding their last end. It threatens not the loss of life everlasting, but the forfeiture of temporal prosperity; it promises not the goods of the life to come, but national earthly happiness. This has been observed by the Apostle St. Paul,² by St. Jerome,³ St. Augustine,⁴ Theodoretus,⁵

¹ *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, div. ii., v. ii, p. 93 f.

² Heb., viii, 6.

³ Dial. adv. Peleg, l. 9, t. 4, p. 2, col. 503, ed. Martinay; ep. ad Dardanum, t. 2, col. 605-609.

⁴ De Gestis Pelagii, c. 5, nn. 13-15; c. 35, n. 62; t. 10, col. 198-200, 224-225, ed. Bened. De civit. Dei xviii., 11; retract. i., 22; t. 1, col. 33, C. ed. Bened.; cont. Faust., xv., 2, t. 8, col. 272-273; ep. 140, ad Honorat., n. 5, t. 2, col. 423; de civit. Dei, x., 25; xviii., 11; t. 7, col. 295, C. D., col. 495, E. F.

⁵ In Deuter., q. 34, t. 1, p. 182, ed Sirmond.

St. Chrysostom,¹ St. Bernard,² St. Thomas,³ Sylvius,⁴ a Lapide,⁵ Becanus,⁶ Fleury,⁷ Vigouroux,⁸ Martin,⁹ and by a number of other writers of the first rank. But the law of Moses does not on that account exhibit a low ethical standard, and much less a positive moral deficiency. The Mosaic law is a political code, the "magna charta," as it were, of the Hebrew commonwealth. The laws of Great Britain are not censured, though they do not clearly define the degree of eternal punishment due to highway robbery, or the amount of suffering in the flames of purgatory ordained for insignificant violations of duty; why, then, incriminate the civil code of the Hebrews for not using eternal reward and punishment as its sanction?

It would imply a moral defect in the Mosaic law, if it supposed the absence of a future life, or the perishable nature of the soul. But even a superficial perusal of the sacred books convinces us of the contrary. Life is to the Hebrew a pilgrimage; death is for him "a going to the fathers," "a being gathered to his people."¹⁰ Nor can it be said that these expressions imply a mere meeting of body with body in the grave. Abraham died at Hebron and was buried in the grotto in the field of Ephron, over against Mamre, while his father, Thare, had died at Haran in Syria, and his ancestors were buried in the land of the Chaldees; still Abraham was "gathered to his people."¹¹ In a similar manner was Jacob "gathered to his people," though he died in Egypt;¹² Aaron too went "to his people," though he died and was buried on Mount Hor, where to our knowledge no Israelite had been interred before that period;¹³ Moses was "gathered to his people" on Mount Nebo, across the Jordan.¹⁴ In several passages of the Mosaic code we find indications even of a retribution in the other life. Passages like Gen. v. 24, ix. 5, Num. xxiii, 10, are hardly intelligible without such a reference to future retribution. Enoch's walking with God appears to be the reward of his piety; God assures his people

¹ In Matt. Homil., x, p. 142, A.; xxxiii., al. xxxiv., p. 386, D.; xxxvi., al. xxxvii., p. 412, A. ed. Bened.

² In Cant. serm. xxx., n. 5, t. 1, col. 1380, E. ed. Mabillon.

³ Ia II^a, q. 99, a. 6.

⁴ Comment in Iam II^a, t. 2, pp. 584-586; comment in Lev., xxxvi., 4, t. 6, p. 543, Antwerp., 1698, 6 in fol.

⁵ Comment. in Lev., xviii., 5.

⁶ Analogia Vet. Novique Testam., c. 3, q. 2, 3.

⁷ Mœurs des Isrélites, n. 20.

⁸ La Bible et les Decouv. Modern, t. 3, p. 170, ff, ed. Paris, 1884.

⁹ La Vie Future, pp. 96 ff; 546 ff.

¹⁰ Gen., xv., 15; xxv., 8; Num., xxvii., 13; xxi., 2; Dt., 31, 16; Gen., xxxv., 29; xl ix., 29, 33; Num., xx., 24-26; Deut., xxxii., 50.

¹¹ Gen., xxv., 8 f.

¹² Gen., xlix., 32.

¹³ Num., xx., 24.

¹⁴ Deut., xxxii., 50.

that he himself will require the blood of their lives at the hand of every man, a promise not fully accomplished in this life. Finally, why should Balaam desire to die the death of the just, unless he expected to receive after death due reward and punishment.

What Professor Schürer says against the Hebrew law regarding its exaggerated externalism, is to the point only if it be understood of the law as developed in the schools of the scribes and Pharisees.¹ The Professor is not alone in his denunciations of the Jewish law in its latter development. Jesus Christ himself incurred the hatred and the enmity of the priests, the scribes and the Pharisees on account of similar charges.² The solemn eight-fold woe which Jesus pronounced against the leaders of the Synagogue on the last Tuesday before his passion, is in great part due to the Pharisaic externalism and hypocrisy. But the Pharisaic laws can no more be ascribed to the legislation of Moses, than the regulations of our street-car system can be imputed to the framers of the American Constitution. We do not intend to vindicate the ethical worth of all the rules of the scribes and Pharisees. Most of these minute regulations concern matters that are, ethically speaking, indifferent. It is of very little consequence, as far as intrinsic morality is concerned, whether we eat with our hands washed or unwashed, whether we wear heavy or light shoes, whether we walk two or three thousand cubits on the Sabbath day; but if law and rule determine all these minutiae for a whole nation, then the interior spirit necessary to every human act will die, and a series of morally indifferent actions will replace the nation's love-begotten deeds, meritorious unto life everlasting.

The ethical vindication of the Pentateuch is still less concerned with the real or imaginary immoral practices ascribed to the Jews in the middle ages and even in these latter days of the nineteenth century. The story of Jewish usury, infanticide, blasphemy against the Blessed Sacrament, murder of Christian priests and people may be seen in Jost's "Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Machabäer," Depping's "Juden im Mittelalter," Raumer's "Geschichte der Hohenstaufen,"³ Hefele's "Cardinal Ximenes," Milman's "History of the Jews," les Études,⁴ Rohling's "Talmudjude," Desporte's "Le Mystère du sang chez les Juifs des tous les temps, Jab's le sang Chrétien dans les rites de la Synagogue moderne," Kimon's "La Politique Israé-

¹ Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, div. ii., v. ii., pp. 90-125.

² Mark, vii., 1-13; Matt., xv., 1-9; xxiii., 1-39; Luk., xii., 37-54; xx., 45-47; Mark, xii., 38-40.

³ 2d ed., v. p. 352.

⁴ Nov. 1889, pp. 380-405, *Civiltà Cattolica*, ser. xii., vol. ix., pp. 32 ff.; 161 ff.; 287 ff.; 420 ff.; 530 ff.; 678 ff.; vol. x., pp. 48 ff.

lite," Hamon and Bachot's "L'agonie D'une Société," Darville's "Un Monde Nouveau," Legrand's "L'âge du Papier," Jubert's "En Israel," Pascal's "La Juiverie," and in almost any of the larger histories of the Jewish people. We mention these reports without pronouncing on their historical trustworthiness. If they are false, they need no vindication; if they are true, they cannot be ascribed to the Mosaic legislation. Rabbinic fancy is as foreign to the Pentateuchal law as Pharisaic casuistry.

We shall then have to examine only those precepts, positive and negative, which are clearly contained in the Pentateuch. A large number of them need no ethical vindication, since they prescribe actions intrinsically good, and forbid actions intrinsically evil. No one will denounce the morality of the Decalogue, for instance, or call the principles of justice in question. Another part of the Pentateuchal law is guarded against the attacks of the would-be philosophic saint by the fact that it refers to matters morally indifferent. To this class belong the ceremonial law, whether it refers to sacrifices or to festal, local and personal holiness, also the law regulating the royal power, and revenue, the jurisdiction of the judges and the peculiar Jewish system of taxation, debt and property. For no principle of justice is violated, where it is understood that all land sold must return to its original owner at the jubilee, and all debts are to be released in the seventh year. But the laws which regard revenge and marriage seem at first sight to need an ethical vindication.

But before examining these laws we must consider three other points which have repeatedly formed the basis of attacks on the Pentateuch. In stating the first of these we follow Tiele.¹ Jehovah was originally a mere tribal God of the Hebrew race, or according to Wellhausen, of the house of Joseph. Other gods shared the honors of Jehovah. It was owing to the influence of the prophets that the tribal god began to occupy the first place in the Hebrew pantheon. His authority continued growing, till finally all strange gods were degraded and their altars destroyed. But even then, if we may believe the rationalistic school, the worship of Jehovah was not the worship paid to a universal god. Others² are of opinion that the Pentateuch and its law knew indeed only one God, but did not state that there is only one God. According to these authors the books of Moses tell us a great deal about the dealings of God with man, but they are very reserved in informing us concerning man's knowledge of God.

All this is based on the recent rationalistic view concerning the

¹ *Manuel de l' Histoire des Religions.*

² cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "Theism," vol. xxiii., pp. 236 ff.

origin of the Pentateuch. In the present paper we suppose the Pentateuch's authenticity, and vindicate its ethical character on the hypothesis of its Mosaic origin. Starting from this point of view, not even the hardest deniers of its divine origin will dare to maintain that polytheism is not expressly forbidden in the Mosaic law. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord."¹ "He that sacrificeth to gods shall be put to death, save only to the Lord." "If any man of the children of Israel or of the strangers that dwell in Israel, give of his seed to the idol Moloch, dying let him die; the people of the land shall stone him." Nor can it be said that in all these passages only the unity of Jehovah as the national God of Israel is asserted. The God whom Israel is to worship and to love as the only Lord, is the same who is said to have created heaven and earth and who is the righteous judge of all the earth.² No other god was, therefore, acknowledged by the chosen people as having supreme authority in any part of the world beside Jehovah.

In point of fact, our opponents in the field of Pentateuchal controversy do not so much insist on the polytheism of the Mosaic law as on the polytheism preceding the promulgation of that law. According to them, the development of Hebrew monotheism, the existence of which they admit, is not owing to the work of Moses, but to the influence of the prophets. After the latter had developed the system of monotheism, there arose a number of mainly liturgical legislators who promulgated the law which is now looked upon as the law of Moses. But the name of Moses was used in the promulgation of the law, only in order to insure it a more general and willing acceptance. According to this outline of the Wellhausen theory we must admit a double spontaneous generation in the development of the Jewish religion. First, a number of monotheistic prophets arise in the midst of a polytheistic people; then a generation of liturgical legislators spring up in the midst of a non-liturgical prophetic school. And with all these unhistorical assumptions primitive Hebrew polytheism has not yet been established.³

There is a second charge against the early Hebrew religion which indirectly affects the morality of the Mosaic law. The Jehovah of the Hebrews, it is said, was adored and worshiped on the heights of mountains. He manifested his awful presence by thunder, lightning and earthquakes. No one could see his face and live. Generation was especially hateful to him, and conse-

¹ Deut. vi., 4, cf. Exod. xxii., 20; Lev. xx., 1-5: Deut. xiii.; xvii., 2-5.

² Gen. xviii., 25.

³ Cf. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes.*, iii., pp. 1-79; *Annales de Philosophie*, Nov. 1880, pp. 101 ff.

quently the first-born both of man and animal was the special object of his vengeance. Abraham is bid to sacrifice his son Isaac to Jehovah; Jephthe vows and sacrifices to Him his beloved daughter; Samuel cuts Agag to pieces at Gilgal before Jehovah; the Gibeonites ask for seven of Saul's descendants to slay them at Gibea before Jehovah; David grants their request to appease Jehovah's anger. When after the times of Josiah no more human sacrifices were offered, the rite of circumcision remained as an everlasting memorial of the bloody nature of Jehovah's worship.

This theory, too, is based on the rationalistic system of Jewish history. The age of the prophets here, too, follows the age of savagery, and is followed by the age of liturgy. Not to repeat what has been said against this false theory, we may appeal to direct prohibitions of human sacrifices contained in the Mosaic code. "Thou shalt not do in like manner to the Lord thy God [as the nations have done to their gods]. For they have done to their gods all the abominations which the Lord abhorreth, offering their sons and daughters and burning them with fire."¹ And again: "Neither let there be found among you any one that shall expiate his son or daughter, making them to pass through the fire; or that consulteth soothsayers . . . for the Lord abhorreth all these things."² Similar passages might be multiplied; but it suffices here to notice the captious way in which the above argument of our opponents is proposed. They know well that the rite of circumcision was probably adopted from Egypt; that an angel of the Lord prevented the bloody sacrifice of Isaac; that the vow of Jephthe was a hasty inconsiderate act for which the father was exceeding sorry; that the sacrifice of Jephthe's daughter probably implies only her enforced virginity; that Samuel's act of slaying Agag was religious, only because it had been commanded by God, but partook in nothing of the nature of a sacrifice; that finally the slaughter of the seven members of Saul's family was a common act of retaliation; still in the face of express laws forbidding human sacrifice these scanty and often explained facts are used to bolster up a theory calculated to destroy the historical character of the very facts on which it is based.

A third charge against primitive Hebrew religion must be briefly considered, since it too implies an ethical stain of the Mosaic law. Besides human sacrifices, we are told, sacred prostitution formed an essential part of the worship of primitive Israel. There were prostitutes of both sexes; the men were called "qedeshim," the women "qedeshoth." From the book of Deuteronomy

¹ Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums* Berlin, 1863 t. i., p. 277 f.

² Deut. xii., 31.

³ Deut. xviii., 10-12.

it is inferred that the income of this institution formed a regular part of the temple-revenue at Jerusalem, as it did at Byblos and at Paphos. It so happens that the very text from which this inference is drawn, expressly forbids the alleged practice. "There shall be no whore among the daughters of Israel. Thou shalt not offer the hire of a strumpet, nor the price of a dog¹ in the house of the Lord thy God, whatsoever it be thou hast vowed; because these are an abomination to the Lord thy God."² No legislator has so emphatically denounced prostitution and fornication as Moses does. While others tolerate this practice, Moses forbids it entirely. Rape of betrothed or married women was punished with death.³ One seducing an unmarried and unbetrothed woman must marry her without power of divorce; or if she refuses to marry him must pay a fine.⁴ Women proved to have been unchaste before marriage are to be stoned.⁵ A priest's daughter, if guilty of fornication, must be burned.⁶ An immodest woman must lose her hand.⁷ Illegitimate children must not enter the congregation till the tenth generation.⁸ And finally there is an express law against fornication.⁹

But Soury and the men of his school are not in the least inconvenienced by these laws. Their very existence is to them the strongest argument for the existence of the crimes which they forbid. In this way all Americans should be considered as thieves and murderers, because the laws of the United States contain stringent regulations against theft and murder. But even apart from all this, who can believe that the God, who in the Book of Genesis, destroys five cities for the abominations practised therein, should in the law, not only allow actions of a similar character, but even be worshiped by their systematic practices.

Without having entered into the details of Soury and Duncer's system, details belonging to the field of history rather than of ethics, we have sufficiently vindicated the unblemished moral character of the Mosaic code against the imputations advanced by those writers. We must now briefly review the Mosaic law concerning revenge and marriage and we shall have done. The so-called law of retaliation or the "just talionis" reads thus: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."¹⁰ It must be noted that the law just cited refers only to the case where "men strive and hurt a woman with child so that her fruit depart from

¹ A male prostitute.

² Deut. xxiii., 17-18.

³ Deut. xxii., 23-27.

⁴ Deut. xxii., 28-29.

⁵ Deut. i3-21.

⁶ Lev. xxi., 9.

⁷ Deut. xxv., 12.

⁸ Deut. xxiii., 2

⁹ Lev. xix., 29.

¹⁰ Ex. xxi., 24-25.

her . . . and mischief follow."¹ We need not consider the question concerning the mischief supposed to follow the injury done to the woman. For the "jus talionis" is in Deuteronomy² extended to the case of a false witness, and in Leviticus³ to the case in which a man causes a blemish to his neighbor.

The law of Moses seems, therefore, to impose a cruel retaliation for any injury received. But the following considerations must be kept in mind :

1. The Israelite is forbidden to bear any grudge against the children of his people and commanded to love his neighbor as himself.⁴ In case he meets his enemy's ox or ass going astray he must bring it back to him, and he must assist when he sees the ass of him that hateth him lying under a burden.⁵ The "jus talionis" was, therefore, not a right belonging to the private citizen, but it served as a rule for the judges. As our laws are not charged with being cruel, though they prescribe capital punishment for wilful murder, so must the Mosaic law be granted the privilege of ordaining certain punishments for criminal offences without on that account incurring the charge of cruelty.

2. The "jus talionis" has its root in a simple conception of justice, and is found in the laws of many ancient nations. Aristotle ascribes it to Rhadamanthus;⁶ it is recognized in the laws of Solon,⁷ in the laws of the Twelve Tables,⁸ by the ancient Indians⁹ and by the Thurians.¹⁰ According to the rudimentary ideas of justice prevalent among the ancient Hebrews as well as among other half-civilized nations, it would have been very difficult to prevent the injured person or his avenger from having recourse to private revenge, had not their sense of justice been satisfied.

3. Besides all this, the common interpretation of the "jus talionis" did not give it a literal meaning. The sum to be paid the injured person must be as near as possible the worth in money of the power lost by the sufferer.¹¹ Jewish lawyers spoke of a five-fold compensation : *a*, the damage must be repaired; *b*, the suffering must be compensated; *c*, the worth of the work omitted on account of the injury must be paid; *d*, the medical expenses must be refunded; *e*, the outward deformity and shame must be compensated.¹²

The last point in the Mosaic law which seems to need an ethical vindication, concerns the marriage laws. We ask too

¹ *Ibid.* 22, 23.

² xix., 19-21.

³ *Lev.* xxiv., 19-21.

⁴ *Lev.* xix., 18.

⁵ *Exod.* xxiii., 4-5.

⁶ *Ethics*, V., 5.

⁷ *Dionys.* *Laert.* i., 57.

⁸ *Aullius Gellius*, x., 1; *Festus*, see "talio."

⁹ *Strabo*, xv., p. 710.

¹⁰ *Diodor.* *Sicul.* xii., 17.

¹¹ Cf. *Mishna*, *Baba Kama*, viii., 1.

¹² Cf. Gladden, *Who wrote the Bible?* *N. Y. Independent*, Sept. 24, 1891.

much of a legislator writing 1500 years before the Christian era if we require of him to view marriage in so pure a light as we see it in the full glare of hereditary Christianity. The personal view of Moses on the nature of marriage is given in the Book of Genesis.¹ Woman is the "help-meet for man," is bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, for whom man shall leave his father and mother, and with whom he shall form one flesh. Besides, only one woman is formed for one man. Moses, therefore, considered marriage as a natural monogamy; its contract is no more rescindable than is the love between child and parent, and the adhesion between bone and flesh.

But Moses as legislator had to deal with a hard-hearted and stiff-necked race. Had the Israelite been bound to live with a wife displeasing to him, the life of the woman might have become worse than slavery and death. The people had for hundreds of years lived in a land where divorce and polygamy were a common practice. Abraham, too, had been induced by Sarai to take her hand-maid, Hagar, that she might by her obtain children.² Jacob, through the cunning of Laban, had been induced to marry two sisters.³ Abraham, again, at the request of Sarai, had cast out the bondwoman.⁴ It cannot surprise us, then to see a similar practice prevail among the Hebrew nation at the time of Moses. The Mosaic law did not attempt what would have been impossible, and would have brought on the greatest evils. Content, therefore, with restricting the practices of polygamy and divorce to the utmost, Moses endeavored to remove all that rendered them especially odious to the Hebrew wife.

The law concerning divorce is given in Deuteronomy xxiv., 1-4; "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and become another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; her former husband which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the Lord." The following points must be noticed in this law:

1. The Septuagint version and a great number of commentators read the text of the law in the following way: "If a man hath taken a wife . . . and given her a bill of divorcement; and

¹ II., 18-25.

³ Gen. xxix., 21-30.

² Gen. xvi., 1-3.

⁴ Gen. xxi., 9-21.

if she has departed out of his house and become another man's wife ; and if the latter husband hate her, the former husband" Thus Moses neither institutes nor enjoins divorce ; he only supposes its possibility in a law which directly forbids a divorced wife who had married a second time, to return to her first husband. Now the fact that divorce is thus made irreparable, insures proper reflection on the part of the husband before he asks for divorce.

2. Besides, the law of Moses does not leave divorce at the arbitrary will of the husband, so that he can send away his wife at pleasure and by mere word of mouth ; a reason must be assigned for the separation and a written document must be procured. Thus a delay necessarily intervenes and prevents hasty action, while the intervention of public authority insures the sufficiency of the reason.

3. In addition to all this, Moses withholds the right of divorce altogether where a man slanders his wife as unchaste,¹ or has seduced her before marriage.²

Thus far we have seen that Moses alleviated the existing custom of divorce so much as the uncivilized character of his people allowed such an alleviation. The same is true of the Mosaic laws regarding polygamy. Without insisting on the polygamy of Lamech, Abraham, Nahor, Esau, Jacob and others, we may at once proceed to examine the Pentateuchal laws which touch the question of polygamy. Neither polygamy nor concubinage are anywhere in the law enjoined ; both are, however, supposed as possible conditions. In Exod., xxi., 7-11, we read : " If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed ; to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money." This law concerns a maiden who is sold by her father, while she is under age, with the understanding that when arrived at puberty, she is to become the wife of her master. We see this from the term " maid-servant " (amah) applied to her³ and from the difference between her condition and that of the ordinary slave.⁴ Moses makes the following enactments in her regard :

¹ Deut., xxii., 13-19.

² Cf. Judg., ix., 18.

³ Deut., xxii., 28-29.

⁴ Cf. Deut., xv., 12-17.

a. She is not to be free after six years' service or at the year of the jubilee ("she shall not go out as the men-servants do").

b. If her master has no intention of making her his wife, he is not entitled to retain her in the event of any other Israelite's being willing to purchase her for that purpose ("if she please not her master. . . .")

c. The master may assign her to his son, and in this case she must be treated as a daughter and not as a slave ("if he have betrothed her")

d. If either the master or his son, having married her, takes another wife, she must still be treated as a wife in all respects ("and if he take another wife. . . .")

e. If the master does not marry the maid, or give her to his son, or have her redeemed by another Israelite, then she is absolutely free, without waiting for the expiration of the six years or the year of jubilee ("if he do not these three things") The only regulation that bears on our question is the one which ensures to the former wife all her conjugal privileges even in the event of the husband's taking an additional wife into the family.

2. The second Mosaic law in which polygamy is indirectly concerned, is found in Deut., xxi., 15-17: "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated: and if the first-born son be hers that was hated, then it shall be when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born; but he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born" Here again, the law of Moses does not in the least approve of the existing custom of polygamy, but merely prevents an act of injustice which the polygamist may be tempted to commit.

3. In Lev., xviii., 18, we read: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life-time." Others translate this passage: "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime." If this last translation be adopted, the Mosaic law positively prohibits polygamy. But if we follow the former translation, which has all the weight of Jewish and Christian tradition in its favor, the limits of polygamy are at least narrowed, so as to prevent the most unnatural crime of conjugal jealousy between sisters.

4. Besides all this, polygamy did not excite at the time of Moses the feelings of horror felt by us. The prevalent desire of progeny prompted at times those very persons to suggest this

practice who were most injured by it according to our views. A law of monogamy would thus have been opposed not only by the Israelitic husbands, but even by the very wives. The only charge then that can be made against the Jewish law in the matter of polygamy and concubinage, is that it did not expressly forbid these practices. For it did actually forbid their effects injurious to the first wife, the first-born son and the natural love of sister to sister. We might as well incriminate the law of Moses for not prohibiting slavery and the use of intoxicating drink, as for not being more stringent in the matter of polygamy. As the uncivilized state of the Hebrew commonwealth did not allow the former, so did the Jewish hardness of heart stand in the way of the latter.

Finally, if it be asked how God could have permitted divorce and polygamy in the Mosaic law, the answers of the learned differ. With regard to divorce the various explanations may be classed under four heads: 1. Divorce was permitted in the Mosaic law as a smaller evil, in order to avoid greater sins. St. Jerome,² Lyra,³ Denis the Carthusian,⁴ Mayronis,⁵ Sotus,⁶ Vignierius,⁷ Lopez,⁸ and several others are of this opinion; Sanchez⁹ calls it very probable.

2. Cajetan is of opinion that divorce was, under the Mosaic law, permitted neither as altogether licit, nor as entirely illicit. According to this author, God dispensed the Jews from the law of the perpetuity of marriage in such a manner as to render divorce only venially sinful. We hardly need to state that this is a singular opinion, and has never found support in theology.

3. Others tell us that divorce was permitted as licit in the ancient synagogue, God dispensing in every case from the bond of matrimony. The principal supporters of this opinion are St. Chrysostom,¹⁰ Albertus Magnus,¹¹ St. Thomas,¹² Durandus,¹³ Paludanus,¹⁴ Maiorius,¹⁵ Antonius,¹⁶ Abulensis,¹⁷ Burgensis,¹⁸ Ekins¹⁹, Petrus de Soto,²⁰ Ledesma,²¹ Veracruz,²² Borrilong,²³ Celaia,²⁴ Palacios,²⁵ Bellar-

¹ Gen., xvi., 3: xxx., 4-9; xxix., 23-28; Exod., xxi., 9-10.

² I. i, comment in Matt. 5; i, 3, in Matt., c. 191.

³ In Matt. 6; in Matt. 19; in Deut. 24.

⁴ In Matt. 19.

⁵ 4 dist. 35, quæst. 1.

⁶ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 2, a. 2.

⁷ Lib. instit., c. 16, sec. 7.

⁸ 2 p. instruct. de matrim., c. 56, quæst. 3.

⁹ De matrim., I, 10, disp. I, n. 5.

¹⁰ Hom. 34, in Matt.

¹¹ 4 dist. 33, a. 25.

¹² I a, 2 æ, quæst. 102, a. 5, ad 3.

¹³ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 3, a. 1, n. 7.

¹⁴ Quæst. I, a. 2, n. 28.

¹⁵ Quæst. 2.

¹⁶ 3, p. tit. 14, c. 10, sect. 3.

¹⁷ In c. 19, Matt. quæst. 46; quæst. 49, ad 6; quæst. 51; quæst. 61.

¹⁸ In Matt., c. 19, addit. 2, Deut. 24, addit. 2.

¹⁹ Hom. 74, de sacram.

²⁰ Lect. 13, de Matrim. Diff. 2.

²¹ 2 p. 4, quæst. 69, a. 7, dub. I.

²² 2 p. speculi, a. 10, concl. 1.

²³ 4 dist. 33, quæst. I, a. 2, concl. 3.

²⁴ Quæst. 3.

²⁵ Disp. 3, concl. 3.

min,¹ Maldonado,² Emmanuel Sa,³ Metina,⁴ Angles Floribus,⁵ Petrus de Ledesma,⁶ Gabriel,⁷ Henriquez,⁸ and several other theologians of high standing.

4. A fourth class of authors hold both the first and the third opinion as probable. To this class belong St. Thomas,⁹ Sotus,¹⁰ Richardus,¹¹ and a few others.

Regarding the permission of polygamy in the Mosaic law, the opinions of theologians differ almost in the same manner as we have seen in the case of divorce. Aureolus,¹² Victoria,¹³ Menochius,¹⁴ Petrus Ledesma,¹⁵ are of opinion that polygamy was permitted to the Jews merely to avoid greater evils. For they think that even God could not have dispensed from the law of monogamy. On the other hand we find a class of theologians who think that God can dispense from the law of monogamy, and that he actually did so at the time of the Mosaic dispensation. St. Thomas,¹⁶ St. Bonaventure,¹⁷ Ricardus,¹⁸ Gabriel,¹⁹ Capreolus,²⁰ Durandus,²¹ Ledesma,²² Bellarmin,²³ Valentia,²⁴ and several others belong to this latter class of theologians. The reader may choose either opinion, as far as our question is concerned; for both sufficiently reconcile the sanctity of God with the practices permitted under the Mosaic law.

The will of God expressed in the divine law of the Israelites tends with an infinitely greater force towards the greatest good than the iron towards the loadstone and the flash of lightning toward its special point of attraction. Still the divine will is in its actual exercise guided by the divine wisdom. And as God "when He compassed the sea with its bounds, and set a law to the waters that they should not pass their limits, and when He balanced the foundations of the earth," duly proportioned pressure and power of resistance; so in the moral order, God is faith-

¹ I. I, De Matrimon., c. 17, ad 14, objec.

² In Matt. 19, n. 8, quæst. 2.

³ In Matt. 19, n. 7, c. 5, n. 31.

⁴ I, 4, de sacrorum hominum continentia, contrv. I, c. 10.

⁵ I pars de Matrim., quæst. 7, de bigamia, a. 2, Diff., 2 concl. I.

⁶ De Matrim., quæst. 68, a. 3, concl. I, 2.

⁷ 4 dist. 33, quæst. I, a. I.

⁸ I. II, De Matrim., c. 8, n. 13.

⁹ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 2, a. 2.

¹⁰ Quæst. 3.

¹¹ A. I, quæst. I.

¹² Cf. Capreolus, 4 dist. 33, quæst. I, a. 2.

¹³ Select. de Matrim. prior pars partis primæ, n. 3.

¹⁴ De Arbitriariis, I, 2, cent. 5, cas. 420, n. 46.

¹⁵ De Matrim., quest. 65, a. I, concl. 2.

¹⁶ 4 dist. 33, quest. I, a. 2, in corp.

¹⁸ a. I, quæst. 2.

¹⁷ Ibid., a. I, quæst. 3.

²⁰ Quæst. I, a. 3.

¹⁹ Suppl. quæst. I, a. 3, dub. I.

²² 2 p., 4, quæst. 67, a. 2.

²¹ Sot. quæst. I, a. 2.

²³ D. c. II, prop. 3 and 4.

²⁴ 4 p. disp. 10, quæst. I, punc. 3, col. 3.

ful and will not suffer any one to be tempted above that which he is able, and will make also with temptation issue, that we may be able to bear it. The laws of the material world trace the paths of the heavenly bodies in the vast expanse of space and regulate at the same time the minutest vibrations of the tiny atom. "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands." In the same manner is the moral law a lamp to our feet and a light to our path, so that the royal prophet could truly exclaim:

"The law of the Lord is unspotted,
Converting souls;
The testimony of the Lord is faithful,
Giving wisdom to little ones.
The justices of the Lord are right,
Rejoicing hearts;
The commandment of the Lord is lightsome,
Enlightening the eyes."—Ps. xviii., 8, 9.

REV. ANTHONY MAAS, S.J.

PIUS IX. AND THE REVOLUTION.—1846–1848.

“**L**ONG Live Pope Pius the Ninth!” The close-packed crowd that swayed and pushed in the Piazza di Monte Cavallo, on the morning of June 17, 1846, shouted loud and long. Amid the boisterous cries of excited men and women, the waters of the modest fountain ceased their song. The giant Horse Tamers, masterful in gesture yesterday, seem now subdued with awe. The wall of the Quirinal opens. A white-robed figure appears on the balcony and lifting a trembling hand blesses the just and the unjust. Few of the crowd that cheered and cheered again, knew even the name of John Mary Mastai-Ferretti. He had, however, played no inconsiderable part in the Church as a Vicar Apostolic, as an Archbishop, as a Bishop and Cardinal. Loving the poor and the suffering, he had given himself to charitable work rather than to public affairs; and yet, on the second day of its meeting, the Conclave had unanimously chosen him to fill the chair of Peter. Of those in the Piazza who could see the new Pope's intelligent features and most winning smile, the good were surely attracted to him for all time. Probably not one that saw, or knelt, or huzzaed, imagined that this same John Mary Mastai-Ferretti was to prove himself—as he did prove himself—one of the holiest and one of the greatest of the long line of holy and great Popes that have been vouchsafed to the Church and the world.

Pius IX. was in his fifty-fourth year. Of his life, thirty-eight years had been devoted wholly to the service of God. Ordained in 1818, he had been promoted to the Cardinalate in 1840. The lamb-like Pius VII. was in Bonaparte's grip when young Mastai received the tonsure. He had been a witness of the trials of four Popes. In a revolutionary jail he had tasted the sweets of “liberty.” The tyranny of democratic “nationalism,” he had experienced in a so-called republic of the new world. Five years at Spoleto and eight years at Imola, where he bore the burden of the episcopal office, had familiarized him with the revolution and the revolutionaries. There he received an education that should have been much enlarged during the six years he passed in Rome as a member of the Sacred College.

The condition of the Papal States between 1840 and the death of Gregory XVI., has been already sketched in these pages.¹ By

¹ In the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1891, pp. 591–592.

his firmness, by his alertness, by his prudent and progressive reforms, Gregory had maintained his sovereign independence, but the conspirators had not laid down their arms. Throughout Europe they were more than ever active in devising, combining, doing, secretly, boldly, persistently, with the frankly disclosed intent of destroying both the spiritual and the temporal power of the Papacy and making themselves masters of that Rome from which "alone can modern unity go forth." Pius IX. knew the skill and the determination of these enemies of all good. There were "friends," however, whose fidelity or prudence he could measure only when they had betrayed him and his holy cause.

The welcoming huzza that went up from the Piazza di Monte Cavallo was echoed and re-echoed round the world. Pius deserved the praise of all good men. From the good among his own people, and, still more, from many that had been far from good, he deserved affection. Beginning his reign with the generous amnesty of July 16, 1846, he introduced reform after reform in the administration of the government and conceded freely liberties enjoyed under no other government in Italy, or indeed in Europe. To the press he allowed a latitude unusual in the world of fifty years ago. To the laity the greater number of the offices were committed. The municipal system was developed in the direction of home rule; the finances were carefully regulated, and the army was re-organized with a view to maintaining order in the States of the Church without foreign aid. Patriots the Popes have been always; the only patriot princes in Italy. To the rule Pius was no exception. He was most Italian of Italians, the most liberal of true liberals. The pacification, the unity, the happiness of Italy, he desired with his whole heart.

The applause of the world was partly generous, honest; partly senseless, unintelligent; partly false, deliberately, calculatingly fraudulent. With the absolutism of European politics the Pope had resolutely broken. He had gone to the people, inviting them to a new and rare freedom. His concessions compelled Piedmont, most unwillingly, to follow in his footsteps; compelled the other Italian princes to remove restrictions that were no longer wise or possible. Metternich looked upon Pius as a declared enemy. Austrian paternalism was essentially opposed to the extension of liberty among the masses; and Austria's paternalism was not exceptional in Germany. Had Pius IX. received patriotic support from the other rulers of Italy, and from the rosewater aristocrats who insisted that they were Italy and the Church as well, he would have united the Italians,—under no single king—and he would have shown the people of Italy how peaceably to acquire and to enjoy a freedom that they do not enjoy to-day.

This fact was immediately apparent to the revolutionaries. It was no less apparent to the ex-carbonaro, Charles Albert. To unify Italy was the revolutionaries' ambition—the unification of an anti-Christian socialistic mobocracy. To unify Italy was the ambition of the Sardinian king—the ambition of an ordinary Cæsar. Rome was the goal of King and revolutionist. “Perish the Papacy, and long live Italy!” was the watchword of the Revolution; and of the Sardinian, “Papacy or no Papacy, long live the King!”

The popularity of Pius IX. excited the jealousy, the fears of actual absolutism, of an expectant dynasty, and of the dictators of the republic of assassination. Mazzini was quick to sound the alarm, and Beelzebub—a most active political agent at all times and in all places—suggested means to suit the occasion. An almost incredible policy of deceit was promptly adopted, a policy pursued with that mad energy and vicious persistence which only the evil spirit can supply. Macchiavelli has long borne a bad name. One day in the Italy of the forties, and he would have re-entombed himself hurriedly, face down. A bold opposition to the Pope at this time, would have been fatal to the conspirators. Pius had won the affection of the real people by his generosity, self-sacrificing devotion to their welfare, and constant proof of honest love. The banished Carbonari who swarmed into the Papal States, who knelt at the feet of Pius, weeping, gesticulating, swearing endless gratitude and fealty, and whose only regret was that his slipper was so easy to reach,—for they would wish to bend their heads even lower down,—they could not well rise up and stab their benefactor instantly. The greater number of them were hypocrites, perjurors, and had been thoroughly trained in low cunning. From the real people, who were then, as they are to-day, Catholic; and who were in 1846 as they are in 1892, devoted to the one unselfish friend they have had, have, or will have in this world,—the Pope,—open traitors to the cause of God and humanity could hope for nothing but a reaction that would have made an end of them. God is patient, and Satan still guileful, serpent-like. The word passed around: Praise, Praise! everywhere, loudly! Lead the chorus! Lead! Lead! Audaciously Lead!

And the enemies of Christ, of virtue, of law, of peace, the perjurors, the murderers led. Mazzini boasted of his part in organizing this campaign of deliberate, monstrous lying; boasted in writing and in public speeches. The real people, the conspirators had not reached. Every criminal, as well as those who were meditating fresh crimes,¹ had joined the Carbonari before Maz-

¹ Colletta, *History of Naples*, Edinburgh, 1858, vol. ii., p. 318.

zini had reached his twelfth year. During the twenty years that the Genoese had plotted, a new crop of criminals had been gathered in; but of Mazzini and his ravings the "people" knew as little as they do to-day. Imagine the Italian laborer of this year of grace conning Mazzini's "Complete Edition of the Duties of Man," or his "Address to the Italian Working Class!" Nor was it the "people" that the revolutionaries wished to gain over. The students, the commercial class, the nobility and the clergy—to these Young Italy appealed, and among these many converts were made. Money, influence, a modicum of skeptical instruction, were forces which, supplemented by the dagger, could be used effectively to overturn the social order, and to rob the people of their rights, their desires, their hopes.

"Write and conspire, riot and conspire, stab, lie, teach falsehood and conspire!" Such had been the instructions repeated to Young Italy year after year since 1833. Now a new clause was added. From Paris in October 1846, Mazzini wrote to his Italian agents: "Take advantage of the slightest concession (by the Pope), to gather together the masses, if it be only to testify gratitude. Feasts, songs, assemblies, frequent relations established between men of all shades of opinions help to spread ideas, to make the people conscious of their force, and to render them exacting."¹ "Speak often, much and everywhere of the sufferings and needs of the people." "There are regenerating words that contain everything, and which should often be repeated to the people: Liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity. These are the words the people will understand, especially if these words are contrasted with the words, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery, etc., etc."²

Throughout Italy the same disgraceful farce was played every day in every community—processions by day and by night, meetings, dinners, balls, street cries, hymns and songs, all in honor of Pope Pius IX. In Rome the round of demonstrations continued for more than a year. Several times a day "enthusiastic" crowds gathered in the Piazza of the Quirinal, where they sang the new Hymn of Pius IX., and cheered the Pope until he came out on the balcony and blessed them. Men carried busts of the Pope through the streets, that the people might see and know their benefactor. At the cafés the glorification of the Pope had neither beginning nor ending. Orators were lauding him in the piazzas from early morn to midnight. At the theatres the actors halted while the audience cheered the Pope. By night the houses were illumi-

¹ *Histoire de la Révolution de Rome*, par A. Balleydier, 4 ème édition, Paris, 1854, p. 12.

² Balleydier, *loc cit.*, p. 15.

nated, and with banners flying the devoted friends of the Pope marched through the streets, candle in hand. When Pius IX. took an airing, his carriage was followed by a pack of revolutionary hirelings who saluted him with complimentary phrases. Occasionally they removed the horses, and joyfully dragged the vehicle with their more than unclean hands. Into the churches they crowded to make a pretense of devotion to the God they had foresworn, and, on great feast-days, they did not hesitate to establish relations with the masses by pressing to the chancel rail, and there, terrible to relate, receiving the holy communion, sacrilegiously.¹

By these methods many simple, well-meaning folk among all classes were wholly deceived. To witness such constant and general exhibitions of admiration for the Holy Father delighted the optimists—and they are always with us. There were nobles, lawyers, physicians, clergymen, students, encouraging the demonstrations. How beautiful it was to see this rare, this hearty “unity!” Meantime the words “Liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery,” were used with discretion. And by degrees the character of the speeches, processions, street cries, was altered. Even when awaiting the blessing in the Piazza, the crowd no longer hailed Pope Pius IX., but merely Pius IX. On a memorable occasion (Sept. 8, 1846), the conspirators made a bold stroke. As the Pope advanced through the flower-strewn Corso, framed in with hangings, with portraits of himself, with banners and inscriptions, he read mottoes whose significance he could not mistake: “The first year of Italian redemption: The end of tyranny: The beginning of the new era of liberty and brotherhood,” and others of like intent. Three months had not passed since the Pope’s election, and yet the revolutionaries were evidently the masters of the city of Rome.

Reject the gratulations of loving subjects, a prince may not who would retain their love. To repress popular manifestations of confidence could only render him odious. An optimist himself, Pius IX. had hoped that even the ill-minded would have been won over by his unselfish efforts to serve the whole people and to elevate them politically as well as materially and morally. When he discovered that he was the victim of his own simple heart and of that malicious guile which, since a fatal day in beautiful Eden, has never ceased to operate, through human souls and human hands, against the truth and peace of God, the day for repression had passed. From Rome as a centre, the whole of Italy had

¹ For details of this campaign of education see Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 140; Mazzini’s *Life and Writings*; *La Revoluzione Romana* S. B. Firenze, 1850.

been organized, openly, by the Revolution. The Holy City was divided into districts. Each district had its club, fully officered. From a central directing body, the district officials took their orders. The club was only the Carbonaro lodge under a more specious form. Daily the clubs received their instructions from headquarters, and thus acted as a unit. The Romans lived a cyclonic life of "demonstrations." At a few hours' notice the clubs were prepared for a procession, a banquet, a meeting, a "popular" manifestation in favor of "reform," and, of course, for a hymn in the Piazza and a blessing from Pius IX. Not alone centres of agitation were the clubs. Their purposes were largely educational. Each club had its journal, a small, well-filled, flowing sewer of lies and immorality. The spoken subserved the written word. False principles, libels, were passed from mouth to mouth. In every important city of Italy similar clubs were formed. The aim, the methods of all were uniform; and the members acted as a unit, often "demonstrating," meeting, banqueting on the same day, and ostensibly, in commemoration of the same event or in honor of the same person.

The club journal was not the only literary venture in which the conspirators were interested. Freedom of the press they had long claimed as a right, only because they desired freely to propagate revolution, irreligion and socialism. "Young Italy," "Young Europe," were professedly socialistic bodies. All the efforts of the former were directed to the unification of Italy under a government socialist and democratic. For the democracy of the United States, Mazzini and his followers had a contempt only second in degree to that which they bore to Protestantism. Their democracy was of a more radical character, and implied a governing power with an undefined "social mission;" a national Church, supreme over the Pope; "a national capital composed of public property, the possessions of the clergy, railways and other great industrial enterprises;" a national system of education which should exclude the dogma of direct revelation. "You shall have no God but God and no interpreter of His law, but the people." The beauties of this system were not easily to be comprehended by laboring men. To youths, at the universities, to tradesmen with a smattering of Voltairianism, to clientless lawyers and doctors with large or small ambitions, the conspirators looked for a full appreciation of their noble ideals and endeavors. In order to reach these various classes, a press was established in Rome as well as in other Italian cities—a press that covertly at first and afterwards boldly, broached the vilest doctrines, the most disgraceful lies, the foulest abuse of good principles, of good men and of good institutions.

The disorderly propaganda of the Social Democracy was not the only obstacle in the way of the pacification of Italy, nor the only enemy that threatened the Temporal Power. A so-called "moderate" party, directed from Piedmont, had its agents in every city. This party was, like Mazzini's, "nationalist" and revolutionary. Mazzini's plans were definite and complete. It is probable that, even at this time, the leaders of the Piedmontese party had a plan no less definite, which they prudently kept to themselves. An Italian nation they would have, but a royalist nation. To realize the idea of nationality, the Austrians must be driven from the Italian soil. On this point royalists and Mazzinians were agreed. What the Austrian lost, the King of Piedmont should acquire. To this part of the scheme the Mazzinians made no objection. Austria defeated, the revolutionary movement fairly started, they expected to unite the people against the princes, and to abolish kingship. When Piedmont ruled Lombardy and Venice, how should Italy be united? The royalists were not of one mind. A league of some sort would be necessary. Should the King of Piedmont, or the Pope be the head, the president of the league? Nothing was settled. The Pope had many "friends" among the royalists. They vied with the Mazzinians in sounding his praises in books, in journals, in speeches. They also advised him on all questions of Church and State, instructed him in religion and politics, and certainly warned him sufficiently against all other friends. *Veri Italiani*, the only true Italians, were these Piedmontese royalist liberals, for they were professedly liberals—liberal Catholics. Like Lammensais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, these inexperienced and not too well balanced men, of whom d'Azeglio is fairly representative, were crammed full of fine phases about liberty. No one else knew the full and proper meaning of the word. They were the first and the only authorized expounders, the only lovers, the guardians of liberty. Religion and liberty had, unfortunately, never been harmonized, as certainly they should have been; but the "liberals" would supply the harmony. By what means? By the very same means that Mazzini would employ—by making a religion of liberty. They did not say this, because they did not see the conclusion that logically flowed from their premises. It was as true then as it is to-day that the philosophical and doctrinal miseducation of the liberty-shrieker are the prime causes of his dangerous aberration.

This Italian liberalism, like French liberalism, attracted a large body of instructed Catholics—real and nominal. In Italy the number of nominal Catholics has always been formidable. Here, in the new world, we are apt to assume that the Italians are eminently Catholic. Our assumption is probably based on the fact

that the blessed remains of St. Peter and St. Paul lie entombed in Rome, and that the successors of St. Peter rightfully rule the Church from Rome. These facts are undeniable, and yet our assumption is groundless. The Pope is always Catholic, and thanks to the Holy Spirit cannot be otherwise, but the Italians cannot claim to be a chosen people,—chosen of God. During this century instructed Italians were sadly handicapped. Every prince, North and South, was practically anti-Catholic. As long as they were absolute the princes hampered the Church in every possible way. The bishops were their creatures, chosen generally, not for those qualities which fit a priest for the episcopacy, but rather for their subservience to the person and their devotion to the policy of the ruler. The schools, the universities, were controlled by the State; and the whole atmosphere of these institutions was tainted with the noxious gases of Josephism and of a qualified Voltairianism. Nor were the seminaries much more Catholic than the universities. The standard of education was low, and the teachers were, on the average, well fitted to keep down to the standard. Naples was not the only kingdom in which the clergy, as a class, was positively anti-papal. Neither from the universities nor from the seminary could the Church hope to draw loyal, obedient, devout, intelligent support; but "liberalism" was sure of a mighty following.

Between 1830 and 1846 the "national liberals" became a power in Italy, thanks especially to the efforts of one man, Vincenzo Gioberti. "Father of the Fatherland," are the words inscribed on the base of the statue set up in his honor in the Piazza Carignano, at Turin, his birth-place. Born in 1801, Gioberti passed more than thirty years of his life somewhat quietly. As a priest he had the reputation of a studious man in search of a mission. Had he not been hot-headed, and too much given to politics, he would not have been banished from Piedmont, as he was in 1833. In Paris and Brussels, teaching and writing, he passed the next fifteen years of his life. After the election of the new Pope, the army of knaves and of fools called Gioberti "the precursor of Pius IX." From the end of 1845 up to the beginning of 1848, Gioberti was morally the Dictator of Italy, says Ausonio Franchi, who well knows the man and the time.¹ "Father of the Fatherland," "Dictator of Italy,"—these are sounding titles. What manner of man was this exiled priest?

In the fourth number of Mazzini's *Giovine Italia* (1834), Gioberti, under the name of *Demofilo*, published an article on "Christianity and Democracy." Let us make his acquaintance at

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, Milano, 1889, p. 162.

the age of thirty-three. “All hail to you,” he writes, “the precursors of the new political law, earliest apostles of the new-born gospel I predict to you the success of your undertaking, for your cause is just and pious, being the cause of the people; your cause is holy, being the cause of God Your cause is eternal, and therefore more lasting than the ancient formulas given by him who said, God and our neighbor; but who now, through your voice and the voice of the country, proclaims God and the people.”¹ These are the words of a revolutionary, an anti-Christian. Perhaps the writer, in time, corrected his youthful errors. If he did not, the moral dictator of Italy was a curse to the “Fatherland.”

In 1834 Gioberti was a Mazzinian. He did not join the Carbonari, some say. He “accepted our leadership,” writes Mazzini. Like Mazzini, ambitious, Gioberti broke away from “Young Italy” and struck out for the leadership of a party, distinct and yet not very different. The Mazzinians looked upon him as a traitor, and thus openly condemned him. Jealous of a rival, Mazzini attacked him on every convenient occasion. Their intercourse was not however, wholly interrupted. In 1847 they met in Paris. Gioberti, be it remembered, was “morally the dictator of Italy” at the time. “I know we differ on religious matters,” said Gioberti to Mazzini, “but, good God! my Catholicism is so elastic you may put anything you like into it.”² If Gioberti used these words as Mazzini states, then we cannot doubt that, in 1847, the Turin exile was quite the same man we knew in 1834. It is possible that Mazzini forged the sentence we have quoted, but even then we cannot charge him with doing an injustice to Gioberti. From first to last what he was pleased to call his Catholicism was elastic, wonderfully elastic; and he found in it a place for everything except Catholicity. This is an assertion and a sweeping assertion; an assertion, however, that can be substantiated by an overpowering array of proof. “I would not exactly say,” Manzoni did say “that Gioberti was wholly outside of the bark (of the Church); he has one foot inside, but the other foot he dangles in the water somewhat too confidently.” Italians are not always polite when criticising foreigners, but of a fellow-countryman they can be considerate—witness Alessandro Manzoni. A Saxon, or even a Celt, would not have so tenderly, gracefully, lifted Gioberti’s other and not too willing foot out of the water.

At Brussels Gioberti was not idle. Four years after the

¹ Mazzini’s *Life and Letters*, vol. i., pp. 312–313. In 1849 the Mazzinians republished this article under Gioberti’s name. Of its authenticity there can be no doubt. See Ausonio Franchi, *loc cit.*, p. 147

² Mazzini’s *Life and Letters*, vol. v., p. 24.

"Demofilo" letter his name was often repeated among cultivated Italians. The author of the "Theory of the Supernatural" (1838) gave promise of great things. Two years later he gained a larger public through the "Introduction to the Study of Philosophy." In 1843 he published a work that made him famous, the "Primacy, Civil and Moral, of the Italians." Until Balbo popularized it, the "Primacy" attracted little notice. Then of a sudden the book was treated with a reverence much above that accorded by many "liberals" to the Bible. The "Prolegomena" appeared in 1845, the "Gesuita Moderno" in 1846, and the "Apologia" in 1848. Meantime Gioberti's dictatorship had been joyfully accepted. The school children were taught reading out of his books. In the universities he was held up as the model for Italian writers. From him a crowd of Seminarians took their theology, philosophy and politics. "Priests and friars in their sermons, bishops and cardinals in their homilies, theologians and apologists in their books, vied one with another in quoting texts from Gioberti as if he were a 'half-father' of the Church."¹

A theologian, a philosopher, Gioberti assumed to be; but in fact he was only a calculating, and, painful to say, an immoral politician. Among the many admirable pieces of critical work done by Ausonio Franchi, the best, perhaps, is the delicate, incisive analysis of Gioberti's mind, character, system, an analysis based on his letters as well as on his works. The warmest admirer of Gioberti could not ask for a tribute more generous than that Ausonio pays to the man who furnished the despoilers of the Papacy with the ideas and arguments that inspired and supported them during a long and a wicked campaign—and that inspire, support them now. Nor can the same admirer well refuse to accept Ausonio's severely just judgment on the man and on his work. However we shall not be wholly guided by the acute author of the "Ultima Critica," though we shall in the interest of the truth, present a fair summary of his discerning and comprehensive argument.

In 1834 Gioberti was consorting with revolutionaries, and anonymously preaching anti-Christian revolution. When next we encounter him, in 1838, he is a pretentious Catholic; orthodoxy itself, and much more Papal than the Pope. He is likewise a conservative, a monarchist, the most positive, combative supporter of princely authority. A good part of the world takes him at his own measure. During fourteen years, friends and opponents try to follow him through a tortuous, intricate maze of contradictions. When they halt, Gioberti is once more openly, vigorously preaching anti-Christian revolution.

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, pp. 156-157.

Between 1834 and 1852, had there been any change in Gioberti? Did he cease to be a revolutionary in 1838? Was he when he published the "Theory of the Supernatural," or at any time thereafter up to his death, in 1852, an orthodox Catholic, an honest supporter of the Temporal Power, an honest believer in the monarchical principle? To these questions, there is a single answer—No! And yet, toward the end of his life, when having fully disclosed his mind, men reproached him for so flatly contradicting himself, he could, as he did affirm that: "My present opinions are those I held in 1838, and in no respect vary from them."¹ Other men's opinions he had changed, leading them speciously from orthodoxy to "liberalism," and filching from them every conservative principle. He alone had been consistent. The crowd of misinformed believers and unbelievers who are occasionally or generally shocked at the narrowness of the Church, might well pause and ponder when they read that Gioberti died in her communion. It was a sad death, sudden and without warning. Friends found his cold body, kneeling on the mean bed in the poor Parisian apartment where he spent his second exile. Beside him lay the "Following of Christ" and Manzoni's "Promessi Sposi." According to report, he said Mass daily in the Church of St. Louis d'Antin. Evidently the man had a kind of faith. However, even though he exercised priestly functions to the last, no one will think of him or write of him as a priest. He lived the life of a political partisan. This was the mission to which he called himself. The love of God or of His Church did not possess his soul, control his aspirations, or direct his efforts. He had set up an idol, Italy; an idol that during his lifetime had an existence only in his own mind. This imagined Italy he worshiped. It was for him, in a certain sense, the Absolute.² And this Italy should become a reality. He, Gioberti, would be the creator. To Gioberti, his own Italy was the world. To be the creator of a world, is to satisfy a mighty ambition. Out of the chaos that Gioberti perceived, he purposed evolving an order, a harmony, a unity, pleasing to himself, and therefore modelled after the eternal archetypes.

Instantaneous creation Gioberti did not aspire to. Step by step he devised the processes by means of which his ideal Italy should be developed into the real Giobertian Italy. When all the parts of his conception had been carefully fitted together, he proceeded to action. Before men he appeared as a theologian and philosopher. In fact he was neither the one nor the other. Nor did he mean to be, except inasmuch as theology and philosophy could

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, p. 151, note.

² *Ultima Critica*, p. 153.

be made to serve his political aims. Were all his metaphysical speculations extended even through a hundred volumes, he would have had but a scant following, unless among the very few who take pleasure in transcendental abstractions; nor would he have had any influence upon the national thought and life. Take away the superlatively dialectical part of his philosophical writings, and he will be still the Gioberti that all Italy knew, loved, acclaimed as the regenerator of its civil life.¹

In the books, Gioberti's "Philosophy" is rightly dismissed as one of several illogical systems of ontology. Mazzini, curiously enough, says that "the regenerator of the civil life of Italy" as his friends called him—"started from the doctrines of Giordano Bruno,"² and the statement is probable. We know that the modern "regenerator" condemned his inglorious predecessor; and yet it is well to remember that some political philosophers have been very subtle, to use a polite word. Modesty is a fault with which no writer has charged Gioberti. He was not the only Italian philosopher, among his contemporaries, who patched up a system. "Orthodox Gnosis" was the name he sought to patent. This fine name covered an old, worn-out piece of baggage. The notion that mankind is to be served by providing it with a scientific religion, of purely human manufacture, is a worm-eaten and indeed a rotten notion. The regenerator, creator, politically, was content, with being a second-hand philosophical upholsterer. He had calculated the effect of his brand-new trimmings.

To harmonize extremes is not an easy problem. Gioberti proposed harmonizing contradictions. Evidently he was satisfied with his success. He was so consistently contradictory that, as the critic we have more than once quoted happily puts it, he can be understood only by those who can appreciate him as a man gifted with "a genius for contradiction."³

From start to finish Gioberti was a rationalist, with quasi-Catholic tendencies. His rationalism and his Catholicism were, however, mere political expedients. Theorizing, he had ever in view a practical end. About the truth of his system he was not exercised. Opportuneness was his guiding principle. Italy he saw divided among contending philosophical and political sects. How to unite them all as worshipers of his private idol, Italy, how to make a nation of "patriots"—such the problem the exile had put to himself. And the answer came: By sacrificing all other things to "Italianism," to "patriotism." Religion, philosophy, democracy, monarchism, he considered thenceforward, as means and only as

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 169.

² Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, vol. v., p. 24.

³ *Ultima Critica*, p. 149.

means to an end, means to be used as circumstances might demand.

In order to effect his purpose, he deemed it of first importance that he should encounter no opposition from any constituted authority. Hence his glorification of Catholicity, of the Papacy, of the monarchy. The conservative elements, the religious elements of society, were captivated. “From every page, from every line of the early works, they were inspired with the love of Italy. No word of apology, invective, theory or criticism, did Gioberti write, without adding the word Italy—glorious Italy, beloved Italy, Italy that would one day be united and supremely great.” Absorbing his “gnosis,” readers were unconsciously Italianized; absorbing his “patriotism” they were unconsciously gnosticized. When the glowing rhetoric of the “Primacy” was poured out on the “moderates,” from afar the exile could see the form of his idol concreting out of chaos. Forthwith he proceeded to give a new direction to the uncertain elements.

The Church, Catholicity, the Papacy, Gioberti had extravagantly lauded during the first creative period. Now in the “Gesuita Moderno” he made war on the “grenadiers of the Church.” Originally, the Jesuits received their share of his opportune applause. Later in the “Prolegomena” he turned on them, unexpectedly, contradictorily. There is an explanation of his infamous book, the “Modern Jesuit.” The writer, pretending to be justified in attacking a great and good Order, was in fact aiming his vulgar and impotent blows at the Church, at Catholicity, at the Papacy. Denouncing abuses that existed, opportunely, in his own false heart and soul—and there alone—he skilfully pushed forward his catholicism, his creed, his church—a rationalistic, materialistic, natural, immoral creed and church. In the hands of a well instructed man of any creed, the “Gesuita Moderno” will ever prove to be a defence, a eulogy of the Order, and a condemnation of the malicious, falsifying author. For in this book Gioberti exposes himself so completely that volumes of self analysis, scientifically minute, could not add to our knowledge of the man. When Mazzini connected Gioberti’s name with Bruno’s, be assured the conspirator did not express his whole thought. The modern Gnostic and the “philosopher of nature” were in many ways similarly gifted. They had the same voluminous, extravagant volubility, the same inordinate self-conceit, the same power of opprobious abuse, the same spirit of self-contradiction. Gioberti libelled good women as well as good men, for he spared the Ladies of the Sacred Heart no more than he did the Jesuits,—a piece of wanton cowardice, which in a virile country would certainly not have been repaid by abject hero-worship. The author of the

"Gesuita Moderno" is not only filled with malice, jealousy, vanity; he is not only ready to tell monstrous lies, consciously, in order to serve a wicked purpose, but he is also directly and indirectly—for he was a master of indirection—traitorous to the cause of Christian faith, morals and piety. It is easy to see that, in great part, his most malignant attacks on persons, principles and institutions, are really poor defences of his own weaknesses, failings, vices. A man who goes to Ariosto for his morals, and who could speak slightly of the purity of a Stanislaus and of an Aloysius; a man who looked upon "*civil* corruption, which is the spiritual death of nations"¹ as a greater evil than moral corruption, may appeal to some varieties of "liberal" Catholics, but will not be recognized by those who hold to sound doctrine and Catholic practice.

Under cover, in this mean and degrading fashion, Gioberti had prepared the "people" for the revelation of his whole thought. This revelation was put in writing, only after he had failed in realizing, with his own mind and hand, an important part of his well-planned scheme. Providence was generous to him, and saved him from getting possession of Rome or of the Pope, and from having a chance to put the finishing touches to his monstrous pagan idol. When he spoke the last word, he was what he was in 1834, rationalistic democratic. The sovereignty of reason and of the nation, are the only sovereignties he recognises. His Church had always been a purely Italian organization, and his Pope never more than the "first citizen in Italy," quite like Mr. Rudini's. Pretendedly, Gioberti recognized the Church as a body independent of the State. Now he proclaimed that the Church neither did nor should exist except as subordinate to the State.

Gioberti we have called a revolutionary; and he was no less a revolutionary than Mazzini. Of the two men, Gioberti was the more dangerous. He had a wit that the other lacked. He reached and influenced minds that Mazzini could not affect. Even Italy can boast of few politicians as consummately Macchiavellian as the "regenerator." Consistent, and at the same time contradictory, we have said he was. His contradictions were deliberate. They formed an essential part of his scheme. And that scheme, artful, mysterious, he pursued during the whole fourteen years of his active life. To succeed, deception was necessary. Therefore, he adopted deceptive means. Any means that would bring success were rightful means in his estimation. His conscience he had formed on a law which he entitled "the law of gradation," according to which self-constituted reformers "should move by steps and

¹ *Il Gesuita Moderno*, Lausanne, 1846, p. 302.

not by bounds, should attack neither error nor inveterate abuses openly; should never reveal the whole truth, but, in order to attain success, should expose their ideas according to the times. To render the truth accessible it is often necessary to hide a portion of it.”¹ The means justify the end.

Guided by this law of his own making, all Gioberti’s contradictions became consistencies, all opportune means were good. He could not be immoral because the moral was his will or fancy. Liberalism adopted his principles, which were in no whit different from Mazzini’s. The theories of the revolutionaries Gioberti did not blame or condemn, on the ground of their immorality, or because they were anti-social, irreligious, anti-Christian, but solely on the ground of their inopportuneness. His “liberalism” was in fact theirs. He and they were legitimate children of the Revolution. He was doing their work, and with “gradation” gave them most substantial aid in their attack “on the Papacy, on the Church, on Christ, on God, on everything that is related to the supernatural, the spiritual, the religious.”²

Mazzini appealed to the force-men, to those who wished to reach a goal by leaps and bounds; the other, made friends among those who were not sure as to what they desired, but preferred being decent under all circumstances. The two “patriots” looked to the clergy for support. Mazzini had not forgotten them when he organized Young Italy. He invited them to aid him in establishing a “good parochial system, and the suppression of clerical aristocracy.” “Religion and politics are inseparable,” he wrote to the priests of Italy. “Without religion political science can only create despotism or anarchy.” On his followers he had long sought to impress a right notion of the power of the clergy. If the revolutionists would maturely reflect on the aim of their enterprise, and on the means by which it must be achieved, “they would learn that if liberty is to be durably founded on the earth, the decree must go forth from a sphere no human power can reach; that had they begun by seeking this sanction, had they appealed to the priests in the name of the gospel, and of Christianity expiring through the faults of those who dared not become its interpreters—they might not now count in every priest an enemy and in every church a centre of opposition and resistance.”³ Mazzini’s efforts were not unavailing. Too many clerics went over to him. Gioberti, as we have seen, a considerable number of them worshiped.

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 179, 182.

² *Ultima Critica*, pp. 174, 186.

³ “Thoughts Addressed to the Priests of Italy,” etc., *Life and Works of Mazzini*, vol. i., p. 246.

Against the Jesuits Mazzini was less voluminously abusive than Gioberti. His instructions were brief and pointed: "The power of the clergy is personified in the Jesuits. Following the tactics of the Socialists, make the name hated in Italy." The Order was the right arm of the Church in the contest with "liberalism" and with the Revolution. The aim of the Revolution the Jesuits had not been slow to discover; the logical outcome of liberalism they had reasoned with certainty. Liberal philosophers they handled without respect to the "law of gradation." Fully equipped, courageous, devoted, they were the scouts, the sentries, as well as captains, colonels, generals of the army of Catholicism. Mazzini's vision was clear, and Gioberti's no less so. If the Church was to be deprived of her temporalities; and to be despoiled of her liberty in things spiritual, then was it highly important that the Jesuit should be driven from the battlefield. Gioberti was not a man of blood, but moral assassination he recognized as a proper, opportune means of political action.

Between 1846 and 1848 the anti-Jesuit cry gradually grew stronger and stronger. "Morte ai Gesuiti!" Not unlikely you may read the words to-day, freshly stencilled on some Italian church wall. From the press, the pulpit, the school-master's desk, the club, the Jesuit and "Jesuitism," were made hateful. Gioberti's lies were exhausted; but not so the malice of "liberal" and revolutionary. When the campaign of "education" had been perfected, the campaign of action was opened. In the streets novice and Father were vilified, stoned, chased. The houses of the Order were attacked, windows were broken, colleges sacked, altars wrecked, sacred vessels stolen or dishonored, statues smashed, pictures destroyed. Assassinations? Why ask the question? Was not the dagger "an excusable fact"—the one bright object that glittered amid the darkness which covered the land? Finally by riotous bands, by court decrees, the Jesuits were forced out of one establishment after another, one town after another, one territory after another. Charles Albert suppressed the Order in Piedmont, at the demand of the rabble. Gioberti's evil plot had not miscarried. His compatriots assailed the convents of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart as well as the houses of the Jesuits. Well might Silvio Pellico say: "Great enterprises begun with acts feeble and unjust are ill-begun."¹

From Rome the anti-Jesuit movement in the States of the Church was prepared and managed. Mobs violently drove the young and the old out of Fano, Ancona, Sinigaglia, Faenza, Castentino. Pius IX. as soon as he had mastered the plan of campaign was not slow in defending the Jesuits and in warning un-

¹ *Cantu, loc. cit.*, p. 173.

wary citizens. To the glorious Order he paid a deserved tribute ; but his words of praise and of warning could not stop the conspirators. Officials, soldiers, policemen—Mazzinians, Giobertians—either helped or tolerated the mob. The Pope was powerless. In Rome itself his commands, his affectionate appeals were as ineffective as if they had never been spoken. There the Jesuits were submitted to unheard of outrages. Night did not put an end to insult or to blasphemy. Candle in hand, with mock or mocking priests to lead, the ribald members of the clubs marched around the houses of the Jesuits, after sundown, singing the Miserere, and mimicking the holy office for the dead. For the sake of peace, and to save lives most valuable to mankind, the learned, pious members of the noble Order left the Holy City to whose fame they have so much added during three centuries.

“Jesuit” was a name deliberately chosen by Gioberti to represent not alone the Society, but all men who remained true to the faith of Christ and to the See of Peter. And Mazzini’s use of the word agreed wholly with Gioberti’s. Persecuting the Order first, “liberals” and revolutionists next turned their attention to monks, nuns, congregations. The fated name “Jesuit,” “Jesuitical,” was applied to religious in general. Insult and violence followed. Then giving the name a still wider extension, all honest citizens, all men of principle, all persons of devout life, were marked as “Jesuits ;” and to be marked was to be martyred—in reputation ; to be maltreated, boycotted, forced out of office however honorably attained, made a victim of, in one or many of a hundred ways. Passion once excited, and who shall fix its limit ? After the good men had been persecuted, the wicked turned one against another. And what more convenient means of reviling a rival, an adversary, a benefactor, a friend who had made his way, than to hold him up to scorn as a “Jesuit.” Every one of the rascals had his own particular “Jesuit,”—the man he would ruin. A just judgment pursued Gioberti. When, “Dictator of Italy,” he had been suddenly lifted into the Ministry of Piedmont and as suddenly deposed, the rabble hooted the disappointed, characterless, ruined politician as—a “Jesuit.” Some wrongs time corrects after a fashion.

Here and there, outside of Italy, a voice was raised in protest against the illiberal, savage treatment of scholarly, virtuous and zealous clergymen. From the narrow and prejudiced world then called Protestant, praise came rather than blame. Here, in the United States, at least one democratic, liberty-loving voice was heard, protesting in manly words against the shameful persecution of the Jesuits—the voice of Orestes A. Brownson.¹ The “patriots”

¹ See *Brownson’s Quarterly Review*, April, 1846 ; July, 1847 ; July, 1848.

were the only "popular" men in Italy. And who were the "patriots?" Ausonio Franchi will tell us. He believed that being Mazzinian, anti-Catholic, he was a pure patriot; but even he was nauseated, horrified at the company in which he found himself. "Yonder man is a cheat, but a patriot," his cronies said to him; "that other is a usurer, but a patriot; and his neighbor is a thief, but a patriot; a forger, but a patriot; an assassin, but a patriot; a sodomite, but a patriot; a trafficker in justice, but a patriot—and the list is not ended."¹ Book-makers and book-reviewers there are, American, who, now and then, regenerate the old anti-Jesuit lies. Have these pretty gentlemen ever considered that, perhaps, a public opinion of considerable weight in this country knows how to qualify them, and rates them duly as no better than Italian "patriots?"

Against absolutism, "liberal," moderate and revolutionary were ostensibly arrayed. Could there be an absolutism more odious, more detestable than this despotism which brutally mastered Italy? Following the lead of Pius IX., all the princes had given proof of an honest desire to grant every reasonable demand for a modification of the existing forms of government. Peaceably, concessions could have been gained that would have made each separate people the controllers of their lives, their liberties, their happiness; but peace had no place in the plan of campaign. And strangely enough, the sole friend of peace, the Church, was always excepted when liberties were enlarged. Practically, there was not a single government in Italy. The mob ruled. To-day's concession was sure to be followed to-morrow by a new demand. Princes halted for a day and talked bigly about their rightful authority and their prerogatives. The next day they had given more than was asked of them. Charles Albert, "sword of Italy," is a fair type of these princes. By his orders the soldiers sabred and shot down men old and young, women, children, because, moved by his windy promise to fight, some fine day, for the independence of Italy, they collected in the streets and expressed their "patriotism" by singing the hymn of Pius IX. Then hurrying from Turin to Genoa, Charles presented himself to the crowd, waving a flag once captured from the Austrians. He had another ready for the priests—the flag of Gioberti.²

Naturally the mob neither respected nor feared such rulers. Governments determined on preserving order could have assured it had they throttled disorder promptly; but a constant show of weakness had made the governments weak and the revolution

¹ Ausonio Franchi, *loc. cit.*, p. 186.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., pp. 150-151.

strong. On a par with the clergy Mazzini placed the soldiery; and therefore the conspirators worked incessantly to gain converts in the army, and were notably successful. In the States of the Church—for Rome was always the objective point—the propaganda among the soldiers was most active. A goodly number of the Carbonari who had taken advantage of the Papal amnesty showed their loyalty to the Holy See by joining the army. The Pope's government forgiving all, forgot all. Old conspirators received commissions, honorable and responsible, and used their opportunities to corrupt the men serving under them. The clubs, the journals, educated the troops into a code that our State militias have not yet adopted. Of this code the first article was: The soldiery should never fire on their brothers, the “people.” However, the conspirators were not satisfied with corrupting the army. They had determined to organize a powerful army at the expense of the government—an army which they could control, and which could be used, at command, against the very power that created it. On July 13, 1847, a terrible plot against the Pope was suddenly disclosed. The Jesuits, several Cardinals, the King of Naples, the Duchess of Parma, and a number of citizens of undoubted character, had conspired with Austria—thus ran the word—to fall upon the Romans, massacre them, seize the Pope, compel his abdication, and place the city under Austrian control. Names were not only stated, but details as to time and place were faithfully recorded. During two whole days and nights the city was full of frightened, noisy, thankful “patriots.” Te Deums were sung in the churches—the Pope and the people had providently escaped. Sworn testimony was produced against the leaders of this vile plot. Everywhere was heard the cry: To arms! But where were the arms? How neglectful we have been! Let every man be armed hereafter; let there be a civic guard! And a civic guard there was. The mob gathered about the Quirinal, a deputation of loving citizens begged, demanded, that every able-bodied *Roman* should be enrolled and armed, so that the Pope and the people should thereafter be sure of defenders against bloody conspiracy. Pius IX., granted the mob a part of its request. A few days later, the “patriots” forced from him all they desired—“forced” is the word, for the Pope stated openly that his action in this matter was not free.

A lie, consummate lie, was the story of this plot; a lie, studied, as were all its consequences. The accused were all loyal Catholics; the accusers were knowing perjurors, and yet they went into court, and adding crime to crime, tried to convict the men whom they had libelled. The Te Deums were burlesques, the lamentations and jubilations mere acting; but the purpose of the con-

spirators was effected. At once the Civic Guard was established in every town in the Papal States. Then the clubs agitated in the other principalities and were almost as easily victorious as at Rome. The Italian mob was armed and accoutred. Each company of the Civic Guard had its quarters—a new revolutionary club.

Mazzini writes of a "species of delirium which took possession of men's minds in 1847"; and yet records the calculated methods by which this delirium was excited. The powerlessness of all the governments, and the tyranny of the patriots, are equally astounding.¹ Mazzini was never idle. His agents, his secretaries, carried his orders to his leaders, and, in special cases, assisted in putting these orders into effect. At Rome he had a number of worthy lieutenants. Charles Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, if not the ablest of the staff, or the most vicious, was perhaps the maddest. To the Papacy he was indebted for his title and estates; and yet he had for years been one of the meanest of conspirators; a spy in the Papal palace and in the houses of the Cardinals, where his name and his dissimulated loyalty gave him admission. During the reign of Gregory XVI., it was Canino's habit to visit the Holy Father, frequently, and, at the Pope's feet, to offer a devout homage. Returning home he hatched conspiracy with all the secret enemies of the Church. Superior to Charles Bonaparte in mental qualities, in finesse, in character was Terenzio Mamiani, who philosophized and conspired, though not equally well. He was one of those re-admitted to the States of the Church by the amnesty of Pius IX. Though he declined to take the oath of loyalty after his return, Mamiani was not disturbed. Like many other Italian rationalists he claimed to be a genuine Catholic, while working with all his might to uproot religion. Smooth, cool, deep, he practised the "law of gradation" much more successfully than it was possible for the expounder of that law to do. As knavish as Cavour, his principles were just as immoral, his purpose the same. His methods, could he have controlled the circumstances, would have been similar to those of the Piedmontese politician. Pietro Sterbini was not less knavish than Mamiani, nor less mad than Canino. As early as 1831, he had been compelled to fly from Rome, with other disorderly characters whose efforts to excite a rebellion had failed. Hiding, conspiring in various Italian cities, after a time he went into France. Later he made his home in Naples, where he adopted the patriotic trade of a government spy. Under the amnesty he returned to Rome, and was at once given a place of authority on the revolutionary committee. Besides editing a scandalous sheet, the *Contemporaneo*,

¹ See *Mazzini's Life*, etc., vol. v., pp. 18, 26, 46.

Sterbini wrote popular hymns, and “spouted” revolution incessantly—in the clubs, in the streets, at banquets and meetings. He boasted of having prostituted the sacraments of the Church, with the intention of deceiving the Pope and of gaining a place of trust in the municipal government. High in the councils of the conspirators, he was an organizer as well as a disclaimer, and to him were chargeable many of the demonstrations of all sorts that were so common in Rome, and elsewhere. Giuseppe Galletti—another honored leader, deserved the confidence of these three gentlemen, for his record was quite as immaculate as theirs. A Bolognese, he had been a Carbonaro in 1831. During thirteen years he promoted rebellion in the States of the Church. Though guilty of blood, again and again, he invariably escaped punishment, so skillful was he in covering his tracks. At length, in 1844, he was surprised. Letters and documents that fell into the hands of the authorities, proved him to be the prime mover in an atrocious plot. Churches and houses he would have fired. Of the ensuing commotion the criminal conspirators would then take advantage; to rob the public treasuries; to seize and imprison the cardinals, prelates, employees of the government, the clergy, nobility, land-owners, police officials and judges—excepting only such as were favorable to Young Italy; and last of all, not publicly, but in the jails, to kill their prisoners, informing the public that they had fled, or been exiled, or were secretly confined. Found guilty, Galletti was condemned to life-imprisonment. The amnesty freed him. He wept as he knelt at the Pope's feet, and swore everlasting fidelity to the Holy See. A good part of his time was spent in telling cardinals and prelates how deeply he loved the Pope. In the Piazzas he addressed the crowd, lavishing praise on Pius IX., and appealing for union and submissive obedience. After he had played his allotted part in the comedy, Galletti resumed the rôle of an audacious revolutionary. A typical “patriot!”

These men fairly represented the intellect of the Roman managers. The material force of the revolution was centered in Angelo Brunetti, better known as Ciceruacchio. An American slang word aptly portrays Ciceruacchio. He was an ideal “tough.” The Carbonari conferred a cousinship on him in 1831. A powerful and passionate brute, he soon made himself boss of the rabble. Ready for anything, drunk or sober, he respected neither life nor property. As his power increased, so did his ambition. The leaders courted him; nobles were his cowardly familiars. He became an orator, the mouthpiece of the “people.” Indeed he was the people—the Carbonaro, “patriot” people. His influence was not confined to the City of Rome. In the neighboring villages

he had agents through whom he controlled the riff-raff of the country, and doubtless many ignorant and many timid laborers. Terror he exercised when he deemed it needful; money and drink he used with discretion. Canino, Sterbini, Galletti, Mamianni, were not his masters, but his political chums. Gavazzi, Bassi, Rambaldi, Arduini, dall' Ongaro, to name only a few among the recreant clergy—for the “patriot” priests had their club in the Holy City—were admirers of Brunetti as well as of the other proper Signori whose acquaintance we have made distantly; and, in their own way aided the “popular” movement against the Temporal Power.

Were the patriots satisfied with demonstrations, hymns, newspaper editorials, lies, salacious books, banquets, meetings, sacrifices? Oh yes! generally. The dagger we do not emphasize; an intermezzo, a dessert, an item, an “excusable fact.” And yet it may be that the “patriotic” Italian dagger is so uncommon in our day, that we are apt to think of it as having been sheathed when Pius IX. came, full of love, of liberality, of peace to the world. “He has done great things,” said Guizot, “such as had not come to the mind of any sovereign for centuries; he has voluntarily and sincerely undertaken the interior reform of his States.” Revolutionary reform was based on the dagger. Persistently was it plied in the States of the Church, in Piedmont, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena. Many a “patriotic” rejoicing ended in tears. A convicted assassin was a “martyr,” but a decent man’s corpse was well out of the way. During the nineteenth century, the Primacy of Italy, in the use of the dagger, is unassailable.

The hopes of the Sardinian dynasty for leadership in Italy could only be realized after Austria had been whipped out of Lombardy and Venice. Hence the monarchists, moderates, Giobertians, “agitated” in the Austrian possessions and outside of them. The German name was abused, patriotically. ‘Away with the German! Then shall Italy be united.’ In this agitation, the monarchists found willing helpers among the Mazzinians. After the Papacy, Austria was their greatest enemy. To acquire the coveted Rome, they could not hope until the German had been deprived of his power to assist the Pope. A war must be. Charles Albert was willing but timid. Could Austria be irritated, or the King’s hand forced, the designs of the conspirators would be forwarded. A broil between Austria and the Pope, how advantageous that would be!

The agitators, in 1847, did all the Mazzinians could wish. Monarchs, moderates, liberals there were who innocently injured their own cause. Austria looked askance at Pius IX., fear-

ing that he was an ally of the nationalists. At home and abroad the conspirators had glorified him as the enemy of Austria. The German and the Jesuit they coupled together. Pius had put himself on record as to the Jesuits. The Papacy had again and again proved its independence of Austria. An enemy the Pope could not be. However his position was seriously complicated by the anti-Austrian demonstrations that were introduced into the plan of campaign. A war of extermination, the orators preached in town and village. At length Metternich, taking advantage of a clause in the Treaty of Vienna, re-enforced the garrison of Ferrara (July 16, 1847), an imprudent act, as events proved. The Mazzinians, nationalists of all shades, demanded that the Pope should declare war. Pius IX. was not moved by their clamors. He protested diplomatically against the Austrian invasion of his sovereign rights. He negotiated with France for military support, if needed. When Austria still further increased its army, the Papal legate at Ferrara formed a camp, and adopted every means necessary for defence against further aggression. Before the expiration of six months, the Austrians agreed to withdraw the larger portion of their forces, and the affair was settled by a compromise.¹

When Pius IX. was elected, the liberals claimed him as one of their own. It was said that the influences which directed the Conclave were Giobertian; and that the new Pope would be an Italian of Italians. Pius had been careful to set himself right before the world. ‘He lost no opportunity to declare himself a Catholic Pope, father of all the Faithful and not alone of the Italians. Nor was he less open in announcing that he purposed² “preserving intact all the rights of the Holy See of which he had been made the depositary.”’ His dealings with Austria made it apparent that he would not falter where the question of the Papal Sovereignty was concerned; and also that as a sovereign he did not intend to declare war against any nation in order to assist the Italian revolutionaries to form a nation. His Catholicity, thus unmistakably established, made new enemies for him in Germany as well as in Italy. Young Italy was prepared to take advantage of his difficulties. To Rome conspirators from every country hurried. A coup had been arranged. The city was absolutely in their power. Pius had tried to rule the mob by words, reasonable words, kindly, sympathetic words, fatherly words; but Ciceruacchio, Sterbini, Canino, had a language better suited to the men they had educated, and they acted as well as spoke. Freely,

¹ *Vicissitudes Politiques etc*, P. Van Durm, S. J., Lille, 1890, pp. 175, 177.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 139.

and under duress, the Pope had granted many demands. The conspirators determined to compel him to give them the control of his government. As it was, they forced him to change a Ministry whenever they felt in the humor for a change.

On January 1st, 1848, a mob surrounded the Quirinal, and Ciceruacchio, in behalf of the "people," was deputed to present the Pope with a written demand for immediate reforms, twenty or more: Secularization of the Ministry, abolition of the ecclesiastical courts, suppression of the regular orders, etc. The deputation was not received. During the month following, the city was in a constant condition of tumultuous disorder. On the seventh of February Cardinal Bofondi was appointed Secretary of State, replacing Ferretti. Four days later the mob demanded a new Ministry, and reiterated their former "conditions." The crisis had come, and the Pope was equal to it.

At four o'clock in the afternoon of February 11th, 1848, Pius met the chiefs of the Civic Guard, for whom he had sent, and thus he addressed them: "Conditions, gentlemen, I shall never accept from anybody. Understand it well! Never shall it be said that the Pope consented to things contrary to the laws of the Church, to the principles of religion. If ever—and pray God it may not be—an attempt be made to do violence to my will, to force my rights from me, if ever I see myself abandoned by the men I have so loved and for whom I have done everything, I shall throw myself into the arms of Providence, and Providence will not fail me."¹ The words were clear as strong. Their meaning could not be misapprehended.

This speech did not please the conspirators; nor did it arrest their contemplated movements. On the evening of the 11th, a mob took possession of the Quirinal Piazza, calling for the Pope. His blessing they hungered for. Pius came out on the balcony. Suddenly there was a cry: "No more priests in the government!" Lifting his right hand, and motioning for silence, Pius IX. addressed the multitude. "Before the benediction of Heaven descends on you, on the Roman States, and, I repeat it, on all Italy, I recommend to you union, concord, and I desire that your demands should not be contrary to the sanctity of the Holy See. Certain cries, which do not come from the heart of my people, are uttered by a small number of unknown men. I cannot, should not, will not listen to them: *Non posso, non debbo, non voglio.* On the express condition, therefore, that you be faithful to the Pontiff and the Church—(Yes, yes, Holy Father we swear it!)—on this condition I pray God that he will deign to bless you, as I

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 60-61.

do with my whole soul. Remember your promise; be faithful to the Church and to the Pontiff."¹

Their promise they did not remember; but the Pope's declaration was public and final. He did not forget it. The enemies of the Papacy were forever separated from the Pope. "Patriots," nationals, liberals, moderates, from this day forth, whatever their honesty, were none the less culpable. Pontiff and Church spoke, as with one voice, the courageous: *Non posso, non debbo, non voglio.*

JOHN A. MOONEY, LL.D.

CATHOLICITY IN ENGLAND FIFTY YEARS AGO—A RETROSPECT.

PART I.

WE have been given to understand that certain justly revered American Catholics wish to put on record some personal reminiscences with respect to Catholicity in England. In deference to their wishes we have written the following pages, but we have done so not unwillingly for the following reasons:

It is obvious that there must be very much resemblance and affinity between "Great and Greater" Britain and that both exercise a powerful influence on the world external to them. We have been informed and believe that the American portion of the Catholic Church has a very great future before it. Records of facts as to Catholicity in England may be expected (on account of the resemblance and affinity above referred to) to be of use to the Catholic Church in America, and through it (on account of its great future) to have a very wide-spread utility throughout the world.

But there is one possible misunderstanding against which we wish especially to guard. It is the mistake, which might arise, that what we shall say here is meant by us to refer indirectly to some person or party, to some school or tendency of thought, or to some prevalent or exceptional practices, now existing in the American Church.

Although we take a very lively interest in all that concerns the United States and, of course, in the Church in the United States,

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 62.

we nevertheless are in complete ignorance as to any controversies which have taken place or are likely to take place within it.

Therefore the following pages are offered simply for what they may happen to be worth as a record of facts, opinions and sentiments which have existed or exist in England, without any unexpressed wish or *arrière pensée* whatsoever.

When our attention first became directed to matters ecclesiastical, we were a Protestant boy at Clapham Grammar School, the Master of which was Charles Pritchard, of late years Professor of Astronomy at Oxford. The Puseyite movement was then (1843) in full career and we formed a close friendship with the Rev. E. Wingfield, who was the curate of St. Mark's, North Audley Street, London, the church our family regularly attended. It was his sister that married the well-known Dr. Ward, who was subsequently deprived of his degree at Oxford for having published his "Ideal of a Christian Church." On account of this work he was spoken of as "Ideal Ward," the humor of the nickname consisting in its application to one whose solid and rotund figure was so eminently "real."

Mr. Wingfield was a very earnest and ascetic clergyman who, like his friend Dr. (then Mr.) Ward, held all Roman Catholic doctrine except that of full Papal Supremacy. At his house we used to meet Mr. Ward with whom we occasionally went to attend the afternoon service at Mr Oakley's chapel; Margaret Street, then a celebrated haunt of very "high" church people. Wonderful is the difference between that shabby, little conventicle with its poor attempts and budding ceremonial, and the stately Church of All Saints, with its elaborate ritual which has long since taken its place.

Mr. Frederick Oakley was notorious and widely reprobated for preaching in his surplice and having two candles alight on his Communion Table. Years afterwards he died priest of the church at Islington and a Canon of Westminster.

Until after Newman's conversion there was very little ritual observance in the English Established Church. Vestments were indeed worn by the Rev. Bernard Smith—subsequently one of the early converts—but we never heard of another instance and his practice was no matter of public notoriety. Then, the service of the Church of England—apart from cathedrals, colleges, chapels, etc.—was almost entirely read by the clergyman and his clerk. The morning prayers were long and tedious, consisting of matins, with the litany, the first part of the Communion Service and a sermon. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was usually administered but on one Sunday in each month and on each Sunday the whole of the congregation except the communicants left before

the second part of the Communion Service began. No cross¹ stood upon any of the tables, nor did candles, even unlighted, save in very rare cases, stand upon it.

Great indeed was the contrast presented in those days between Catholic worship and that of the Protestant Church. This contrast also did not by any means consist alone in matters of ritual, but quite as much in the devout demeanor of the worshipers in our poor Catholic chapels, contrasted with that to be seen in ordinary parish churches. In the latter there was order and decorum indeed, but in the former there was the expression to a degree not then to be elsewhere met with, of a sense of God's presence and direct communion with Him.

This forcibly struck us and some of our companions, when we first began to be an occasional witness of Catholic worship—with-out at all understanding it.

In those days Catholics were relatively few, especially amongst the poor; the great influx of Irish not having then taken place. The Roman Catholic religion was detested, but individual Catholics were highly respected as good, scrupulous and very devout people. One hears men and women of that generation, sometimes spoken of now, as "old-fashioned Catholics who kept the Commandments."

Signs and relics of the penal days still remained amongst us. Then the best known chapels in London were still connected with foreign embassies—once a condition necessary for their very existence.

One of the most interesting was the Sardinian Chapel in Lincoln's Inn, which dates from 1648 and was sacked in the revolution of 1688. In it, about a dozen years before² our retrospect begins, a figure of our Lady was erected for the first time since the Reformation—not without much trepidation and many objections. Between 1833 and 1836 a small one was placed in a niche under the gable of the west end of a church designed for the Jesuits and built by the Gallini family, in St. John's wood—a humble imitation (in iron and plaster) of the ancient church in London of the Knights Templar. We can recall nothing of the kind elsewhere. Among the results of the long continuance of the penal laws was not only a habit of concealing all things Catholic, as much as possible from Protestant eyes and ears, but a certain distaste for external manifes-

¹ So far as we know, but we have been told that one did so at Bonchurch, in the Isle of Wight, where it had not been recently put, but had survived for many years, perhaps upwards of a hundred.

² By a priest named Bernasconi as we have been informed.

tations, not obligatory, had come to exist among even very excellent Catholics.¹

The Spanish Chapel,² which dated from 1791, was designed by Bonomi, had some pretensions to ornament, but had capacious galleries on either side, while a sort of private box with a window looking into the gospel side of the sanctuary, served for the members of the Spanish Embassy. The Bavarian Chapel, in Warwick Street, was similarly galleried and in point of decoration was plainness itself, save that for High Mass, very distinguished opera singers used to perform in the organ gallery, on which account this chapel³ used to go by the name of the "shilling opera."

The French chapel, which also dates from the end of the last century, still forms part of a row of stabling, and is an interesting relic of the past. We have been told that during the French Revolution seven eminent French prelates used to sit on a bench in its sanctuary during High Mass.

In those days the Catholics of England consisted, for the most part, of a number of highly respected families of long descent, some of whom like the Tichbornes of Tichborne and the Middletons of Middleton, were said to have remained substantially the same since the days of the heptarchy.

Such families mostly led retired lives, never having mixed with Protestants of similar social position, at school or college or in the political arena—from which law, as well as custom, had excluded them.

They often had their chaplains who said Mass in their private chapels, some of which had never been used for Protestant wor-

¹ One result of the pains and penalties to which Catholics have been so long subject for hearing, and much more for saying "Mass," was a habit at least here and there, of suppressing the use of that word. In parts of Lancashire "Mass" was spoken of as "Morning Prayers" and "Vespers" as "Afternoon Prayers."

As an example of the distaste above referred to, I can recall the case of a very pious and exemplary Catholic of Lancashire who was asked to join in a subscription for a great novelty—namely, the erection for the first time of a statue of our Lady in his chapel. He was a regular Communicant and zealous supporter of his religion. Nevertheless, his quaint reply, in his Lancashire dialect, was: "Who wants statoo? I've done very well without statoo. Confound statoo!"

² This has just ceased to be used on account of the lease having expired. Long ago, however, its side galleries and "private box" were removed, while the chapel had acquired a great number of images of various kinds. It is replaced by a large church in a very severe and simple early Gothic style, which has just been erected in its vicinity from designs of Mr. Goldie.

³ It is still in use. Unfortunately very good intentions have resulted in destroying the historical character of this old chapel without converting it into a building which any person of taste can possibly admire. Had it been left as it was in the middle of this century, it would have constituted an interesting survival of the state of things which existed amongst the English Catholics when emerging from their political disadvantages. It was one of the chapels plundered during the Lord George Gordon riots.

ship and were very old—that of Stonor dating from A. D. 1349. That of Haslewood Castle, Yorkshire, is of the thirteenth century and that of the Eystons of East Hundred, of the fourteenth century.

Amongst such families were the Berkeleys, the Egertons, the Blounts, the Beddingfields, the Petres, the Mostyns, the Radcliffes, the Vavasours, the Constables, the De Traffords, the Lawsons, the Stricklands, the Tempests, the Cliffords, the Welds, the Arundels, the Howards, the Stourtons and Langdales, and many more. Besides these much esteemed families—who all knew each other and persistently intermarried, often (as has been supposed) to their physical detriment—there was a scanty population in a certain number of villages, with some farmers and laborers, and also a sprinkling of respectable shopkeepers, and a few professional men. There were a good many medical men, Chancery barristers and conveyancers; while a few districts in the North, notably in Lancashire, had uninterruptedly remained of the old religion.

Under these conditions, the Catholic clergy enjoyed an amount of leisure whereof the great immigration of poor from Ireland which has since taken place, has, as a rule, deprived them. Accordingly not a few learned priests gave distinction to the small flock in England and enjoyed the friendship and esteem of Protestant students devoted to similar pursuits. One of the best known was Dr. Lingard, so celebrated for his admirable history of England, but whose “*Monasticon Diocesis Exoniensis*,” published in 1845, is a folio work of such completeness, fulness, detail and accuracy, that no other diocese in England (probably even in the whole of Christendom) can boast of possessing its equal. Another illustrious priest was Dr. George Oliver of Exeter, and another was Dr. Rock, whose well-known work, entitled “*Hierurgia*,” dates from 1833. There was also Dr. Tierney who wrote the “*History of Arundel*,” and, did space permit of descriptive explanation, many more names could be here brought forward.

Thus the Catholic Church in England, half a century ago, consisted of a certain number of distinguished families, their dependants and the poor; while the middle class was barely represented, and indeed it is but very feebly represented still.

There was a scanty clergy (but 683 priests in all England and Wales in 1846) with a creditable proportion of learning-devoted men, amongst whom apostates were almost unheard of.

The country was divided into eight Districts, or Vicariates, whereof Dr. Griffiths was Vicar-Apostolic of the London District and Dr. Walsh Vicar-Apostolic of the Central District,¹ with Dr. Nicholas Wiseman as his coadjutor.

¹ This comprised the counties of Derbyshire, Leicester, Nottinghamshire, Oxford-

Only in the Central District were there any religious communities of men, even in 1846; and these consisted of Passionists, Redemptorists, Conceptionists, Dominicans, Rosminians and Cistercians, while there were but thirty-four convents of women in all England.

But though the externals of religion were for the most part simple and unobtrusive, a great movement was on foot and had already made a considerable advance. The first beginning was in the early days of the present century and it was greatly promoted by the illustrious Bishop Milner.¹ In the year of 1844, that great architect and man of distinguished genius, Augustus Welby Pugin, had been received into the Church and was hard at work diffusing a knowledge of correct principles by his incisive writings and marvellous powers of drawing; while setting an example in practice by means of the churches he designed and saw raised. John, the sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, was not only a most pious Catholic, but a munificent patron and promoter of mediæval art. His country residence "Alton Towers," gave Pugin much opportunity, while in its vicinity an admirably picturesque group of buildings was being raised as a residence for a warden and assistant, six decayed priests, twelve poor laymen, a schoolmaster and a school for poor boys.

But his typical work was, as it should have been, the Church² which he erected at his own cost at Ramsgate and wherein he now lies buried. That, and a large number of other churches designed by A. W. Pugin, were, in 1844, rapidly rising in many places in England, through the exertions of a considerable number of men, cleric and lay, who were all alike animated with a zeal for the beauty of God's house and the dignity and solemnity of worship. One of the most zealous was John Hardman of Birmingham, a manufacturer who made the foundation of the most perfect specimens of mediæval metal work, a true labor of love. The admirable choir thus instituted at St. Chad's sings its solemn music to this day and is the mother of the School of Music at Ratisbon.

This development was by no means confined to England, but extended through Northern Europe—that is through France, Belgium and Germany. It was no doubt an outcome of that great reaction from the ideas and sentiments of the eighteenth century, known as Romanticism, which was so much promoted by Chatau-

shire, Shropshire, Staffordshire and Worcestershire, which together were (in 1846) reckoned to contain a population of 2,284,240 souls.

¹ His essays were published in 1810 and 1811 and it was he who built old Oscott.

² This I believe was never thoroughly completed owing to the death of the Earl and his Catholic successor, after whose decease the magnificent Chapel of Alton Towers was defaced and made a lace for Protestant worship.

briand's "Génie de Christianisme," in France, and in England by the writings of Sir Walter Scott. Converts as yet, however, were few and far between. Amongst them there were those who must find mention here. One of these was a refined and tender-souled gentleman who was then known as Ambrose Lisle Phillips,¹ and who has but recently departed from amongst us, having been latterly known as Mr. Ambrose de Lisle. The other convert was the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, younger brother of the third and fourth Earls Spencer and son of the second. He was a man whose patience, humility,² self-denial and zeal for souls were alike admirable. After being for some years a secular priest, he joined the order of Passionists, and died in 1864. To them we shall have hereafter to refer.

In England, outside the Church, the mental atmosphere in 1844 was different indeed from what it has since become. A love of physical science was spreading, but it seemed to present no special danger for Christianity, although the geology of Lyell and others, made a few minds somewhat ill at ease. Zoology and botany certainly looked harmless enough. Darwin had just returned from his memorable voyage in the Beagle and was quietly resting at Down, meditating and feeling his way towards that which was not to startle the world till fifteen years afterwards. Professor Owen was promulgating, by lectures given at the College of Surgeons, his theory of the transcendental principles underlying the construction of animals—principles akin to the ideas of Oken and Gœthe. These lectures were a mixture of mysticism and anatomy, attractive to many minds and amongst them to Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and subsequently to our own; for ever since we were a child we had been passionately devoted to natural history. In those days then, men's minds were not carried away from Christianity by problems of biology, nor had Biblical criticism or a critical study of the first two centuries of the Church's history, raised difficulties such as those which have had since such wide-spreading consequences. The movement of thought in England was at that time mainly in an upward direction as regards religion, struggling against the stupid Protestant conservatism of ignorant churchwardens, and of estimable and pious Evangelicals. There was certainly a great outcry against the surplice in the pulpit and against Popery and Jesuitism, but irreligion did not dare

¹ He was the first to erect a rood in England, since the Reformation.

² Once when a friend from his father's saw him take his ticket at a railway station and exclaimed "My dear Mr. Spencer, why do you go third-class?" "Because there is no fourth," he replied. On a much later occasion another friend said to him, "If you don't take care, some day you'll die in a ditch," when he answered, "What a glorious thing to die in a ditch in God's service." Such in fact, was the very death which God accorded to His loving, good and faithful servant, George Spencer.

to be openly aggressive towards Christianity. The general public were more occupied about "Free Trading" than Free-thinking, while, in the higher classes, infidelity was apologetic in tone and, being deemed "bad form," was far from common. No young man in those days could hope to make his way socially amongst fine ladies, by undisguised irreverence and profanity.

The movement towards more solemn worship and the building of churches like those which existed before the separation from Rome, was extending far and wide in the Established Church. The "Camden Society" was doing good service, and a monthly publication, entitled the "Ecclesiologist," was unsparing in its criticisms of ignorant and barbarous arrangements.

There was a manifest rivalry between High Church Anglicans and the Catholics of those days¹ as to who could build churches the more completely in harmony with the traditions of mediaeval England. This rivalry it was easy to understand, and it had a reasonable and practical basis. The Anglicans desired to substantiate their claim to be the real "old Catholic Church of England," and to make out that the Catholics were but an intruding set of Italians, full of un-English ideas and sentiments, while the Catholics wished to demonstrate that they were, what they really had always been, the representatives of the Church founded by St. Augustine.

It was under these circumstances that we first came under the influence of the conflicting waves of religious controversy, which was then a struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism—not between Christianity and unbelief. For that controversy no book was ever written, which I know of, that nearly equalled Milner's "End of Controversy." Its careful perusal almost convinced us that it must be our duty to submit at once, though it was impossible not to doubt whether it could be right and reasonable for a mere youth to take so important a step, which all the great leaders of the Tractarian movement, still hung back from taking. In the mean time we were removed to King's College, London, taking up our residence in the house of Mr. Brewer, since so celebrated for his important historical labors in connection with the Record Office. He was then a Master of King's College, who in his own house always wore a cassock and he himself told us that he accepted all Roman doctrines except that of Papal supremacy.

Like many others interested in the High Church movement, we took great interest in architecture and antiquity, and in the spring of 1844, made a short tour to see some of the more celebrated

¹ The Gregorian tones were obtained, we have been told, by Newman from the English College at Rome. They were otherwise unknown in the Church of England.

recent buildings, and it was thus that we, for the first time, formed the acquaintance of a Catholic priest. Such insignificant personal matters, are, as need hardly be said, only mentioned because of their connection with one or another period of Catholic development in our country.

Birmingham was then one of the centres of religious revival and Catholic life in England; and there, not long before, had been opened one of Pugin's most memorable churches—that of St. Chad. It was a lofty structure, with very tall pillars, and the Sanctuary was enclosed with a noble rood-screen surmounted by a fine ancient rood, both of which, we believe, had been obtained in Germany. Over the Altar was a shrine enclosing what were believed to be the relics of St. Chad, which had found their way there somewhat mysteriously through the instrumentality, as was said, of Mr. Charles Dr. la Bar Bodenham, a most kind and amiable young gentleman and a very zealous Catholic who was the last representative of an ancient Herefordshire family.

Service at St. Chad's was, and still is, most solemnly performed, an *Opus Dei* indeed.

That church served as the cathedral of the Midland district and the handsome gothic throne of the Vicar-Apostolic was placed in its Sanctuary. Nearly opposite the front of St. Chad's, was the Bishop's house; a brick building of Pugin, excellent in design and arrangement. The dining-hall had a high-pitched open roof and was (on a much smaller scale) like the dining-hall of a mediæval college. Adjoining the library was the Bishop's private chapel.

At the moment of our visit the Bishop was not in residence, but the head priest was, the Reverend John Moore, subsequently the third President of the college known as St. Mary's, Oscott. He was one of the most zealous promotors of that style of art which has the best right to be called "Christian," since both its first origin and its full development took place under Christian influence.

It was through him that our final conversion and reception, in the Bishop's private chapel, took place, at a second visit, some weeks later. Before that, however, two other visits were paid which it may not be without interest to our readers to record. The first of these was to the nascent Cistercian Abbey of Mount St. Bernard in Charwood Forest, Leicestershire. Its members were the representatives of religious who had been driven from France by the Revolution and who were for some time sheltered at Lulworth, Dorsetshire, by Mr. Weld, but who had now received the endowment of a considerable tract of land through the munificence of Mr. Ambrose de Lisle before mentioned. He also greatly aided them in the erection of their monastery which, in 1844, was rapidly

approaching completion under the superintendence and from the designs of Augustus Welby Pugin. We have since seen various other Cistercian abbeys on the Continent of Europe but we know of none which is, from an architectural point of view, so complete a reproduction of the past as is the Abbey of Charwood—although even yet, forty-seven years later, the monks have not, alas, acquired sufficient funds to enable them to complete their Abbey Church. Here the Cistercian life was, and still is, carried on in all its rigor, and St. Bernard, did he revisit the earth, would have no reason on this account to reproach his English sons. The first abbot—Abbot Palmer—was a man of singular simplicity, earnestness and straightforwardness; a very realization of an ideal Cistercian monk. The existence of this abbey and the life there carried on, had a potent effect on many minds in England and no small share in their conversion. The second visit was that paid to Nottingham, for the sake of seeing the large Church of St. Barnabas which Pugin was rapidly completing there. It was a cruciform building, most severe in style, with aisles and external chapel around and beyond the choir, beneath which was a crypt. The wooden sedilia were copied from those which were once in use at the great Abbey of Westminster.

Having an introduction to the local priest we were made to join his mid-day meal, at which were present the Bishop of the district and his coadjutor, and thus we became acquainted with the venerable Dr. Walsh and with his coadjutor—afterwards known all over the world as Cardinal Wiseman. With them (after visiting St. Barnabas) we travelled towards Derby, when, as the train waited at one of the stations, a remarkable-looking, handsome Protestant minister, most urbane in manner, entered the railway carriage and greeted the pair of bishops. This gentleman has since also acquired a world-wide renown as Father Faber, the Superior of the London Oratory, the author of "All for Jesus," and of so many other hymns now sung, we are told, on both sides of the Atlantic.

It was Dr. Wiseman's influence which finally disarmed domestic opposition to our reception into the Church. It was exercised on a father whose memory the lapse of time yet more endears, on account of the wise liberality of thought which blended in him with affectionate sympathy for conditions of mind which were not his.

An illustrious convert had shortly preceded us, namely, Mr. Scott Murray, then M. P. for Buckinghamshire and a great friend of Mr. Douglas, subsequently known as such a pious and exemplary Redemptorist, who built the charming little church of "Our Lady of Victories," in what was once the very hot-bed of Evangelicalism—Clapham.

But converts were still very scarce in spite of all the surging waves of controversy of that memorable time. They were "*Rari nantes in gurgite vasto.*"

On this account the Rev. John Moore determined to turn each one to as much account, for purposes of edification, as might be possible, and so a nervous stripling of sixteen summers, was made to stand in the doorway of the rood screen, after High Mass on Sunday, and recite aloud, to the Clergy seated in front of him, the "Creed of St. Pius the Fifth."

That stripling has since felt that he may have done the right thing in the wrong way, by thus acting on his own judgment and anticipating the submission of his masters and teachers—Messrs. Wingfield, Ward, Oakley and Newman. To questions of philosophy and to difficulties touching the fundamentals of Christianity, he was as yet a stranger, but the logical outcome of the dispute between the Church and the churches, was as clear to him then as it has remained ever since.

Unfinished education had to be somehow completed, and Oxford which was to have been his destination was now made impossible owing to Catholic disabilities then existing at the English universities of the Isis and the Cam.

Therefore St. Mary's College, Oscott, was to be our abode for the next two years after a short interval which was to be spent in France in the company of the Rev. John Moore.

It was then that one of the more interesting pilgrimages was made which it was possible for an English Catholic to make. Alas, that it is no longer possible and alas, indeed, that, by an act of the clergy, it is no longer possible for an English Catholic to make such a pilgrimage again.

We set out in a hired carriage from a town south of Paris, to visit those most interesting cities of Sens and Auxerre and afterwards the Abbey of Pontigny; and here, by the way, a word of caution to travellers may not be out of place, for it is but too probable that the morals of the country drivers may not have been improved through the various political changes of the last five and forty years. Our shambling steed having at last justified our fears by coming to utter grief, the driver proposed to fulfil his contract by transferring us to another much larger vehicle, the driver of which was (as both drivers assured us) to keep the vehicle for our exclusive use for the rest of the journey. Then the Rev. John Moore showed that his disposition partook too much of the dove and too little of the serpent, for he paid the stipulated fare in advance, so as to allow the first driver to return remunerated in proportion to his services. Night came on and with it rain, and then first one, then two, then several persons of both sexes were taken

by our conductor up into his ark, against our earnest remonstrances. We should not have objected to some addition for the benefit of belated wayfarers, but we became crushed to suffocation by persons not only reeking of garlic, very wet and very dirty, but also very drunk. Our evident disinclination for their company was, of course, not understood, and was put down to the pride of confounded English aristocrats. Therefore small mercy as to pressure was accorded us, while, at not infrequent intervals, we were regaled with the then and there popular chorus:

"Jamais en France, jamais l'Anglais ne regnera."

The region we visited was rich in memories of our great St. Thomas of Canterbury, one of whose ample chasubles is preserved in the Cathedral of Sens.

The old Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny dates from the days of the first fervor of that austere order, and exemplified its protest against the luxuries—even the luxuries of church adornment—of the world of that day. The severe simplicity of its church remained and the luxury of stained glass had never been allowed within it. Nevertheless it was none the less permeated and embued with the artistic spirit; and so the white glass of its windows, all in small pieces, was arranged, with the lead which held it together, in beautiful, though colorless, mosaic patterns.

We were conducted by the priest who served the church to some steps immediately behind the high altar. These we ascended and then saw in a shrine, through large apertures closed by crystal, the entire body of St. Edward Rich, formerly Archbishop of Canterbury, lying there as he had lain since the thirteenth century. His head bore on it the low mitre of his period; the ancient chasuble was gathered up in copious folds by his crossed arms, and the long and slender maniple and stole clearly showed, by their embroidery as well as by their shape, the antiquity of their date.

It was to us a solemn and impressive thing to gaze upon that venerable and sacred form, unchanged through all the centuries of war and revolution which have successively swept over the land.

In the spring of 1882 desiring to renew once more an experience which had for so many years been cherished by loving memory, we again visited Pontigny. A generation had passed away and irreverence and vulgarity had been rampant.

The precious old glass was removed and replaced by the most contemptible and vulgar colored glazing—all thought or care for the early Cistercian spirit and the long traditions since, had evidently departed. This was bad, but when we reached the shrine

itself, we found, to our horrified amazement the venerable form clothed in a staring, brand-new, white and gold, French chasuble of the most modern cut, and an enormous mitre to correspond! The ancient vestments—which surely themselves might be regarded as relics—had been taken off and were hanging in a museum which the priests of the place had got together.

We said to the conducting priest : “Surely such a change could not have been effected without damage to the body of the saint?”

“Oh,” replied he, with a shrug of the shoulders and a most exasperating smile, “*Quelques petites dislocations!*”

Resuming the question of Catholicity in England, our next reminiscence concerns Oscott, where we went to reside as soon as we had returned to England.

St. Mary’s, Oscott was a college which had been built, in part by Pugin, not long before, and shared with Downside (the Benedictine College) Old Hall (from Douay, in France), Ushaw College (also from Douay) and Stonyhurst (the Jesuit College), the task of educating the Catholics of England—and other countries, too—both clergy and laity.

The President of Oscott was Dr. Wiseman, then Bishop of Melipotamus, but some early distinguished converts were already in office there. Thus, the Vice-President was the Rev. Dr. Logan, who had been an officer in the army and has since been known—especially at Cambridge, where he had afterwards resided till his death—as a very distinguished mathematician.

The Hon. and Rev. George Spencer was the confessor of many of the lads and of the present writer amongst others, who has no words wherewith to fitly express his love and veneration for that precious spiritual guide. The Hon. George Talbot was then studying there for the priesthood. He had been an Anglican Rector, but in later years was widely known as the Monsignor Talbot residing at Rome and the valued friend of Pius IX. Another ecclesiastical student was the Rev. Bernard Smith, who had also resigned a valuable living (in Lincolnshire) of the Established Church, and is now a Canon of Northampton and still (what he has been for many years) the pastor of a lovely little church at Great Marlow, designed and raised by A. W. Pugin, at the expense of Mr. Scott Murray, the convert before referred to.

Another ecclesiastical student was Francis Amherst, the head of an old Catholic Warwickshire family. He was devoted to religious art, and had built, with Pugin’s aid, a charming chapel at historic Kenilworth, near which was the family house. He subsequently died Bishop of Northampton, universally esteemed and beloved.

Lastly must be mentioned a very remarkable convert, a native

of that English fragment of the old Duchy of Normandy—the Island of Guernsey. This was M. Peter le Page Renouf, whose active, logical mind had quickly convinced him of the overpowering claims of the Catholic Church as compared with the Anglican Communion. He had therefore quitted Oxford before taking his degree and was now wearing a cassock at Oscott and hesitating as to whether he should go on for Priest's orders. This he did not do. On leaving Oscott he was for a time private tutor in one and another family in France, after which he became a professor at the Catholic University of Dublin, under Dr. Newman. After Dr. Newman's retirement, he was made a Government Inspector of Schools and finally received the appointment he still holds of a Keeper of Antiquities in the British Museum. While at Dublin he became known as an adept in the study of hieroglyphics, on which subject he is now one of the first authorities in the world. His reading had been wide, even when he came to Oscott, and he had an acquaintance with German philosophy, then rare in England. For the two years during which the present writer resided at Oscott, M. Renouf was his private tutor. It was under his tuition that we were first introduced to philosophy and various speculative views and historical facts which affected the whole basis of Christianity as conceived of by a raw young convert accustomed only to the controversy with Protestantism.

On an early day of our acquaintance he left written down in our room the subject for our afternoon work. Never shall we forget our dismay when we opened the paper he had left and read its only contents, which were:

“Analyse your ideas of Time and Space!”

Oscott College was, and is, a fine Gothic building with a noble library, the shelves of which were remarkably well furnished. Amongst other noteworthy works was an excellent copy of the Bollandists' “Lives of the Saints.”

The dining-room for the superiors, where we took our meals, was, and is, decorated with life-sized portraits of Dr. Wiseman and other persons of interest to Catholics, painted by the late Mr. Herbert, R. A.

The chapel was a handsome structure with a capacious sanctuary lined on either side with stalls. Its altars, furniture and decorations of all kinds were in the Gothic style, and all the chasubles used in it were of relatively ample proportions and neither French nor Roman.

Great pains were taken to make the lads understand ecclesiastical art, and to take an interest and acquire a knowledge of ritual. A. W. Pugin was the Art Professor, but we did not meet him there during our residence. We had however come to know him and a few words concerning him must terminate our retrospect.

We were taken by Mr. Scott Murray to call on Pugin, who was then residing in one of the quaint old houses of Cheyne Row, Chelsea, in company with his second wife, who showed us some of her Gothic jewelry, which had been made from her husband's designs. Pugin was a rather short, stoutish man with a pleasant face and a hearty cordial manner—he was always very kind to us. Singularly negligent in his dress, on one occasion when entering a first-class carriage in which were several men, a dandy amongst them addressed him, saying: "I think you have made a mistake in your carriage." "I have," he replied, "I thought I was coming amongst gentlemen!"

He was greatly beloved at Ramsgate where he lived and was most charitable. He was always very zealous as regards rescue from shipwreck. In the cause of Christian Art he uttered some extravagances, but then without enthusiasm no cause can be carried far. Thus he has been known to speak in depreciation of some one by saying, "My dear Sir! he is a man who does not know what a 'mullion' is." On one occasion he went up to George Spencer in a sacristy, where he was vested for benediction in a cope of bad design, and taking hold of the vestment said to him, "My dear sir, My dear Sir, what is the use of praying in a cope like that?"

In the year 1844 the very large church of St. George, at Southwark, was in course of erection and he was greatly tried by the financial conditions which rendered it impossible for him to carry out the plans he desired. This so seriously affected his health that it is believed to have hastened his end. He was beloved and esteemed by all those known to us who knew him. The effect he has produced in the world has been vast, and will be lasting, but he has by no means always received the credit which was his due, and which has been not unfrequently attributed to others. Thus his golden rule as to architecture was never to build anything for ornament, but to construct what was useful and then make serviceable vehicles for ornament. This saying has been assigned to Ruskin, but we have heard Pugin's own lips enunciate it at a date long anterior to Ruskin's teachings.

ST. GEORGE MIVART, F.R.S.

SECULAR EDUCATION.

IT is not the intention of the present essay to examine or compare the various methods of imparting instruction to youth, the branches which should compose the curriculum, the amount of time that the pupil should devote to each, or the nature and grade of ability requisite for the teacher. Certainly, when so many methods of teaching, at variance with and entirely opposed to each other, are employed—when, in one town or college, certain branches are systematically taught as fundamental, which, in the next city or university, are utterly ignored—when a twelve-month course of lectures suffices for graduation in medicine, half-as-much again provides us with legal ability, and preachers, or, at least, persons who desecrate the name by arrogating it to themselves, are manufactured with equal dispatch—when, in short, all grades of ability, or lack thereof, are employed in teaching, from the giddy miss of sixteen, whose letters disgust one by their silliness and unconscious display of crass ignorance, to the sleek professor of ancient languages, the merely elementary parts of which he but faintly comprehends—we say, that in a country where this is notoriously the case, the system of instruction pursued must manifestly be vicious, ought to be ventilated before the public, and to be re-established upon a correct basis. But we have no idea that such work can ever be accomplished by the "National Bureau of Education," which, if not run, as is strongly suspected, merely in the interest of a few prominent publishing firms, is certain to find itself very soon their subservient instrument.

The depreciation of currency, or silver as compared with gold, is small and unimportant as compared with that which would ensue in the intellectual market-value of those who should go forth furnished with a governmental diploma; and, while Government has a right to emit her promises to pay, *ad indefinitum*, we maintain she has no right to stamp what may be, and under her auspices must, in the vast majority of instances, prove to be a poor article of brain and culture, as though it were sterling coin and legal intellectual tender.

The point is this: We believe, in all honesty, that the present system of public schools in the United States (and, wheresover, under the control of government, no religious education and instruction are imparted simultaneously with the primary, academic, and scientific), is vicious, *per se*, and baleful to the individual so instructed, and to the community; and we propose, briefly, and in

all candor to give our reasons for the faith that is in us. We say nothing, save by implication, of the instruction and education given in the colleges and universities of our country (which we believe to be faulty, not merely from the want or inadequacy of religious training, but from their failure to impart the actual knowledge and consequent mental discipline which they profess to give; but we shall advert to these in another paper.

He who said, "Let me make the songs of a people, and I care not who makes their laws," would have been nearer the truth had he said, "Put into my power the selection of teachers in primary, secondary, and grammar schools, and I care not who may be their subsequent guides, or what their studies;" for, in these schools is laid that foundation which is little apt to be ever thoroughly upturned.

Now, as is frequently the case, the most of the disputes with which the periodical press teems on this so much vexed question of education, arise from misconception by the disputants of the terms employed, on either side, and very frequently from personal acrimony; and a desire to put down an antagonist has its share in the contest, so that, in the war of words, the real point of issue is lost to view. It is impossible for us to understand our antagonist, if he uses terms diverse in signification to express one and the same thing. It is equally as impossible for us to refute him, for what he says must be sheer nonsense. We may, it is true, combat what we think he means to say, though he fails in the expression of his meaning. But this is merely a multiplication of words to no purpose. We have no right in the argument to take for granted anything but what our opponent *says*, and thus we avoid setting up and vigorously overthrowing a man of straw; a process so common in debates upon education as to have become trite through "damnable iteration."

Men who have studied logic, so that it has become part and parcel of their minds (and to what use would the study be if such be not the result?), will see, at a glance, that the two terms, *education* and *instruction*, while almost invariably used as synonymous, in disquisitions on this and kindred subjects, are actually so in no respect. They will also perceive that many honest thinkers are, by this vague, indefinite, and interchanging use of the two terms, led to illogical results; and these are the men who do harm in matters pertaining to the moral and intellectual domain; we mean the honest and conscientious men who, though deceived, are themselves sincere. Your plausible man, who speaks or writes almost equally well on either side of any subject, soon becomes transparent even to the most indifferent or obtuse. Let us, then, have a clear understanding of the actual par value of these terms. It

is certainly quite as important as the value of Central R. R., Pacific Mail, or other stock this morning.

Now, *Education* is, and ought to be, both by its derivation and the usage of the word among thinkers and writers, *a disciplining of intellect hitherto untutored; the establishing of principles hitherto little known, unknown* (or rather floating in *vacuo*); *and the regulation of the sensibilities and moral affections hitherto sprouting forth in wild luxuriance.*

This is palpably very different from *Instruction*, which may properly be defined as *the imparting of a knowledge of facts, mental, physical, or moral, with the mode of using such knowledge for the greater advantage of the individual and of the community.*

Is it to be wondered, that when terms, inherently so different, have been constantly used as synonymous, so little headway should have been made in the discovery of the right and of the wrong in this matter? If, in mechanics, we make use of inadequate instruments, we shall attain inadequate results. In logic, the terms used are the instruments, and the results will be correct, or the reverse, just in proportion as we know, or do not know, the significance of our terms.

So much being premised, we contend that *instruction without education* is not only not a *desiderandum* but an *abominandum*, not only useless but really pernicious, and that better would it be to impart no specific instruction whatever to the rising generation, rather than that which has been so very appropriately named "Godless education."

We hold that of all curses, one which is most bitter both to society and the individual, each affecting the other, is the attainment of extensive knowledge without acquiring at the same time, firm moral principles and ability to control the passions and senses; and of this fact not only history but experience furnishes us with abundant proofs. But this is decidedly not only the tendency, but the professed aim of the public school system. According to this theory and practice, no actual religious instruction, as such, dares be given—the time of the pupil must be entirely occupied with the acquirement and memorizing of facts, and indeed the warmest defenders of the system contend that this acquisition of information, or as they delight to term it, "the diffusion of intelligence," will render mankind so impervious to the assaults of vice, that religion, technically so called, will become, as it were superfluous—the work being fully as well, or better accomplished by the fact-cramming process of the schools.

The system of public education has now had a fair trial of over fifty years in Prussia and more than forty years in the United States. In the former country it was the result of governmental

enactment, with little or no reference to the will of the people; in the latter, it was the apparent free-will offering of the larger majority of the people themselves, many of them doubtlessly thinking that such a system might be productive of good results. Long before this, the Greeks and Romans had tried the same thing in the matter of instruction, and we find on one and the same page of history the sage Socrates sacrificing a cock to Æsculapius, and the debauched but highly instructed Alcibiades living in an atmosphere of profligacy which astounded even the licentious Athenians of his day. Pericles and Aspasia, the writings of Aristophanes—of Lucian—of the author of “Eros and Anteros,” *et id omne genus*, prove the entire absence of all morality, or even semblance thereof, among the Greeks who certainly were, in their day, in full possession of all the “diffused intelligence” then diffusible. Their subsequent decay as a nation is, to the observing mind, thoroughly limned out in the kind of instruction imparted to the youth of the country. Voltaire and his imbecile admirers thought they had discovered something new when they undertook to flout the Almighty—but the Greeks justly claim the ground by right of prior discovery, for they could revile the ministers of their religion—the only one they knew, and objurgate their gods with a venom not inferior and a sarcasm by far superior to the soi-distant philosophers of the eighteenth century. And though comparatively few of them were perfectly armed with this style of instruction, and their books still extant are few, we feel the ringing tone of thought of that class, as must ever be the case, for it permeates the whole of Greek society from κυλον κάγαθοι to the Helots, and in addition, to the downfall of the ancient Hellenic nationality—the results of that antique instruction are still felt by their scattered descendants, who reap the full force of the wrath of Him who has menaced to visit the “iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation.”

What shall we say of the Romans, the only other great power of antiquity of whose system of instruction history gives us more than a faint outline? They either substituted instruction for education, or the laws for the latter, thus ignoring religion entirely, and their own system (wretched as it unquestionably was), would yet have been preferable to none. As a result, we see that the *Liberti* (from the nature of their status in society, supple, knavish, and devoid of principle), had in their hands the training of the youth of Italy in her palmiest days. The earliest results we see are the extant writings of Plautus and Terence. Later we find the “Ars Amatoria” of Ovid and his epistles. Anon, Petronius Arbiter, Apuleius, Juvenal and Martial, Tibullus and Catullus, etc., till finally we descend to Joannes Secundus. This was the

literature of the people ; Virgil, Cicero and Horace (the latter frequently vile in his writings), were about as much read in comparison with the former, as are nowadays Milton and the Letters of Junius when compared with Swinburne or George Sand. We see the almost incredible depravity of the then people of Italy palpably evinced in the pictures, statues, paintings, utensils, furniture and decorations extant or otherwise excavated from their burial cities. We suppose that at the sight of the remains of the ancient Romans on view in the *Museo Borbonico*, there is not a man of this day, however depraved, who is not overcome with stupefaction at the fact that such a depth of infamy and obscenity could be imagined, still more that its existence should be unblushingly exposed in public and *coram familia*. Certainly no Christian, no upright Hebrew, sees them without a startled blush that he could belong to a race of men capable of such awful depravity. Shall we then wonder, that after incredible butcheries amongst themselves, conspiracies and insurrections immeasurable, Rome should have become a prey to the Goths and Vandals ? Nay, rather let us learn something from the lessons of history, and be prompt in preparing the remedy for ourselves.

Nor is it only from antiquity that the lesson comes to us. We may see elsewhere, and in modern times, that the same causes are producing the same results, and that whenever and wherever this diffusion of intelligence is going on, without reference to the "one thing needful," there also immorality is constantly on the increase. We have only to take up the papers of the day to discover that apathy or listlessness in religion, and opposition thereto, keep pace with the progress of that style of purely secular instruction which ignores religion ! The morals of Prussia among those thus taught need no comment to one who has traversed that country intelligently, and the shameless practical application on the part of the Prussian government of the dictum that "might makes right," will sufficiently indicate to the non-traveller what is the tone of public sentiment throughout the land. Now Prussia should be, were there any good in the system, the very model and example to all other countries, since two full generations of men now in active life have been brought up under that system of schooling which we so much deprecate. (We have in our own country not as yet attained the high moral ground of forcing parents to send their children to irreligious schools, but we are fairly embarked on the trip to that ultimate goal). It is well known that so-called rationalism and materialism have long pervaded the German schools of theology. We know that it is an extremely rare thing to meet with a cultivated (we use the word for want of a better) Prussian who does not sneer at the theory and practice of religion,

and while but a minority of them admit themselves Atheists, yet that is the real name to which a large majority of them are entitled, since they live "without God and without hope in the world." Marriage is a form revocable almost at pleasure; crime of every kind is rampant; fraud is esteemed knowledge of the way to live; debauchery is termed seeing life and derision of things sacred, a mark of intellectual culture.

In days long past we somehow inbibed the idea that the Scotch were an innocent and an educated people. We know that ample opportunities for instruction were provided, that the ministers of the multitudinous shades of religion were abundant among them; that a strong tendency to religious feeling exists in the race, and we thought that under such concomitants as we were taught to believe rife in that favored land, the Scottish peasantry must be very innocent and happy; indeed, we had no doubt that all this combination of circumstances might have surely been productive of good results. It is disagreeable to have one's idol shattered by the unrelenting opposition of facts demonstrated to eye and ear. One shrinks on finding that his theory, founded on what he believed to be correct information, will not bear the keen edge of statistics; so that we will just suggest to the inquirer after facts to glance at the Scottish statistics concerning bastardy, or to read the Scotch provincial papers for criminality, or to pass a few days in Glasgow, Inverness, or Kircudbright; and if he does not come to the conclusion that there is a talent for profanity there developed, a universality and depth of drunkenness there displayed, speaking loudly in regard to the educational (God help us all!) influences at work, then we confess we must have visited the towns mentioned at an unfortunate juncture, read the papers without understanding them, and summed up the statistic tables incorrectly.

In our own country, who dares contend that we have become purer or better; that crime diminishes as instruction is diffused; that religion prospers in sequence with such intellectual instruction; or that public or private faith is better kept? We make all admissible allowance for the rapid increase of our population by immigration as well as for the deteriorating effects of the civil war upon morals; but with every possible grant of this and similar sort, we are constrained to admit the steady lowering of morals. Cunning and trickery become in business daily more shameless; honor and integrity are rapidly becoming by-words; a striking deterioration is going on both in private and in public life. Time has been within our own recollection when a high municipal office was considered a sufficient endorsement of personal integrity; when a State legislator was necessarily a man who could not be bought; when a member of Congress would have considered him-

self insulted by the mere suspicion of collusion with any "ring" or "alliance," and when a Senator of the United States was really what he was firmly believed to be, viz., *the impersonation of high moral and political honor!* We only ask almost any observant and intelligent man: Is this so now? What is our literature? Instead of the "Federalist," we have buncombe orations sounded from Dan to Beersheba. Impeachments are made and the measure voted down by the self-same parties. We say nothing of wholesale theft, even of the Presidency. Men sent by the people to vote, manage to be conveniently absent when an issue of importance arises, or the tide is watched to find on which side it may be popular to vote, or if present, they discover suddenly, by the aid of tangible arguments to their credit in the banks, that cimmerian darkness had hitherto absolved them. Trashy novels are the mental pabulum of readers; prurient pictures of police news and sporting gazettes usurp the place of—we will not say *pious* or *moral* (it would be too ridiculous!) but of simply innocuous reading. Our young men swear, drink, gamble, and manage to debauch themselves like young lords—where that style of cattle exists; our young women corrupt the tide of their lives, physical and moral, by gloating over the lascivious pictures or descriptions of the *bordelle*, or the ocular manifestations of shows and theatres. Orphan asylums and foundling hospitals are filled to repletion, and our ecclesiastical authorities find it necessary to warn publicly against infanticide *ante partum, post partum* and *in partu!* Truly our mode of instruction is diffusing information with a vengeance! Divorces have become most sickeningly common; the marriage tie is held of light value, more easily dissolved than an ordinary trade partnership. Abandonment is of daily occurrence. Are not murders and burglaries rife? Is not intoxication by both liquors and opiates on the increase? Is prostitution declining, or does it not rather flaunt itself, with ever-increasing boldness, in the full face of day? We need hardly say anything of profane and blasphemous swearing—so common, that one fears to take children or females of the family to any public place.

Now it may be said: "These things are sadly patent in the large cities, but they do not pervade our whole country; they exist in the great marts of traffic, but are unknown in the rural districts, and in the smaller cities and towns." Unfortunately this is not the case. The youth of Minneapolis and Omaha can and do curse and drink, talk slang and obscenity equally with the most proficient New York rough or Baltimore plug. "They swear terribly in the army at Flanders," quoth my Uncle Toby; but for the most appalling taking of God's name in vain, we could give a point or two to the Rev. Lawrence Sterne! As to honesty in

dealing, among merchants and manufacturers we might waive the "shoddy contracts" of the war, and the gambling in stocks and lands; the lotteries approved by law in some States, and pass on to the "diffusion of intellectual attainment" in the adulteration of food, etc. If the *World's* chemist failed to find a pure article sold among all the grocers and druggists whose stock he sampled; if weight was scant and chicory superabundant in coffee at New York, what must the parents of our young Minneopolitans and Omahaians be drinking there, or further on, beyond borders of civilization? No. Our large cities are but *a large stock on hand* of the population, samples of which we have distributed North, South and West to the Pacific. Having travelled over the country pretty extensively, we know in sadness what we affirm. But it is a long story, nor likely to be a popular one. A very reliable authority has said: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Was the fall in common honesty a sequence of too much catechism?

But even beyond this and in a worse form we find that deceit and hypocrisy have permeated the body politic and social to such an extent that it is not uncommon for persons who wish to succeed in particular localities (whether as politicians, professional or business men) to take a pew in, or make themselves members of the special church society which may then be fashionable. This is considered a very clever "dodge," and thus some of the most profane swearers, gamblers and habitual violators of every command of the Decalogue are found acting as wardens, vestrymen, trustees or influential members of churches, or meeting-houses, in various places that we wot of. A friend of ours, who, though an irreligious man—unregenerate, he called it—was no hypocrite, told us that he was actually advised to become a member of a certain sect for a *specific purpose* and he was laughed at by a member of the said sect for this "over-squeamishness" when he objected on the rather fair grounds that he did not believe in the doctrines. His adviser volunteered the pithy remark that he had personally "*made money by the operation!*" Here, however, is the test—the *experimentum crucis*. Does it matter, if you possess \$500,000, in what way you acquired it? Suppose you have become possessed of it by swindling government or individuals, as fraudulent distiller or brewer, or member of some whisky combination; by gambling successfully in stocks or railroad, or at faro, or by sharp betting on race-horses; can you not—yes or no—simply on the ascertained fact that you are the possessor of that sum of money, go into any society, or *celebritate*, that you may select, with few and rare exceptions, from Maine to Florida, from New York to San Francisco? Success is demanded, not personal honor or mental ability, and

success is nowadays understood to mean *money*. While the germs of this public and private corruption exist, of course, in human nature, yet we find that their vigorous growth and luxuriant manifestation have commenced and gone on in the same years and *pari passu* with the Godless instruction of the public schools. We must see, if we will take the trouble to observe, that it is increasing therewith, and that it threatens speedily to sap the foundation of our government by depriving parents of their rights, so that the final toppling over of the edifice will hardly be a loss, so corrupt shall we by that time have become as a people, or as they term it, a nation.

We affirm in like manner, that neither the general, nor the State, nor any other government that ever has existed—saving the Theocratic—can or ought properly to be the dispenser of *instruction*; as to what we have defined as *education*, no one will thoughtfully contend that government should dare to take the task from parents. If we look at Prussia, where attendance is mandatory and where (it must be admitted), the teachers are, for the most part highly competent to impart the instruction required in the various grades of their schools, a great injustice is done to that large class of the population who prefer no similar instruction for their children to the Godless one there imparted—and think, in short: “What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world, and suffer detriment in his soul?” And, indeed, up to date, it has not quite yet been asserted that science, or intellectual attainment has saved any one. In our own country (and here would be a chance to make great protestation of loyalty and love for the land of our birth—but we fear those who protest too loudly!) there is super-added to this injustice the fact, that owing to the mode in which the details are carried out in this system, the entire working becomes a very complicated method of sham and swindle; for whereas in Prussia the teachers are almost always competent as mere instructors, and the examiners and referendaries posted as to their duties, this is by no means invariably the case with us, whether as regards the examination of teachers for appointment or of pupils for advancement. The “Boards of Education” are notoriously selected without, in the very nature of the case, much, or even any reference to a knowledge of the subject with which they have, or should have to deal, but rather, it would seem, with a remarkably clear reference to their utter want of any knowledge worth mentioning of the matter, and probable inability to acquire it. In many places, a ward or pot-house politician, a vender of lager beer, a cigar-maker, and a carpenter (the last two may be very good and valuable members of society *quasi* cigar-making and building), are fair samples of the men who do up the educational business

as by law established! By these, teachers are to be examined, appointed or displaced—books to be noticed and introduced, or rejected—plans of study to be arranged—punishments or their hindrance to be made lawful—contracts to be made—property to be purchased and sold—and supplies of all kinds to be attended to. These men are competent for this multifarious duty or they are not; which is it? Now, that such and similar men are appointed to this arduous task is quite inherent in the system so long as it is a state affair, and consequently a political matter, and the fact of the appointment of such men to this office, is so universally the concomitant of the system of “School Boards,” that people who are sensible cannot divest themselves of the opinion that “School Boards” and corruption walk for the most part hand-in-hand, or with a very narrow intervening space. All who read the papers know how contracts are jobbed—how and what kinds of school-books, etc., are supplied—how often text-books are changed, and what influences appoint and retain teachers. Now, we would object to this kind of instruction, even if it were the very best article, yet it is not that; and we still more strongly object to it when we discover it to be a spurious imitation of an originally worthless note. We object to it being put in the power of such men as have almost invariably controlled the system as now existent, to say who shall teach our children, or from what books they shall acquire information; and if men must swindle, there are so many (more *legitimate* we had almost said), less injurious modes of doing so, that we would fain close up this opening by which incalculable injury is inflicted upon helpless parents and their offspring. So long as the State has control of instruction in our country, the public school system must be, under present auspices, a political machine—here radical—there democratic—and neither long in any one place. The precarious tenure of position by teachers—the frequent changes of books and modes of instruction—the fraud incident to the control of money not their own, by men in no way individually responsible for its proper use, are so many crying voices against the whole system. The government might as well supply us to-morrow with a new religion, details of worship to be managed by the politicians, etc., aforesaid, remarking at the same time to us: “You need not believe this as yet, but you must pay your quota towards the requisite buildings—the support of ministers and the maintenance of worship. You are at perfect liberty to pay for the support of your own church, until such time as we may deem fit to exact uniformity in this as in other governmental matters.”

Hence it follows also, that a gross injustice is done by our State governments, in imposing taxes for the maintenance of the public

schools upon those who are not only not benefited but positively injured by it. Why, surely we are even now ready to admit the injustice done the tax-paying negroes of by-gone years in forcing them to pay for the support of schools, to which they could not send their children—judges learned in the law, having clearly shown that while it was highly CONSTITUTIONAL for the negro father to pay school tax, it was equally as highly unconstitutional for Sambo, junior, to go to that or any other school. If we do not mistake, the Common Council of Baltimore had it in contemplation, at one time, to refund to the negro schools (established by the negroes on their own account), the sum total of school-tax arising from the negro population of the city during several years. We do not know whether it was ever carried into effect, since just about that time, a change came over the spirit of Baltimore's political dream—and politics render consciences very elastic. In any case, we are now obliged either to furnish schools for the negroes—to admit them to our own, or to turn over to them the tax which they pay for the support of this system, said money to be by them disposed of as they may deem best in the procurement of instructional facilities. How should it not then be apparent, even on the most superficial glance, that it is wrong to take the property of Catholics for the support of schools, which they, if conscientious, cannot patronize, very much puzzles our comprehension. What! Must I not only see a wrong daily enacted before my eyes, but also pay for the support of that wrong? Not only passively endure the injury done myself and others, but actively contribute thereto by my purse? Even England of "penal law" infamy, saw at length the glaring and flagrant injustice done the poor Catholic Irish, in requiring them to support that enforced Church-system which they detested and, as Catholics, did abhor; but it seems the United States is the country where a Catholic must not only support his own schools, where the education which he wants is imparted, but he must also pay for the support of others with which he has nothing in common—whose tendencies he abominates—and rather than send his children to which, he prefers they shall entirely forego instruction, barring what he may himself have time and ability to impart. This may be law, but it is not justice, and we have faith enough to believe in the eternal principles of justice in opposition to any law ever enacted.

It may be well also to bear in mind that while there are over 6,000,000 of Catholics, yet they are not the only persons aggrieved as individuals, or in their collective capacity. Many of the straighter sects of Presbyterians detest the common school, or pauper-school system, for reasons {similar (*mutatis mutandis*) to those for which Catholics oppose it. That highly reputable, lib-

eral and learned body of Reformed Presbyterians, whose synod seriously proposed setting the Deity on a proper basis by getting the matter lobbied through Congress to a constitutional position, certainly cannot desire to debar the Omnipotent from the schools; the Jews cannot, and from what we know of them, do not relish much the scraps of New Testament daily flung to them after the fashion in which the oath is administered at the Custom House. Badinage apart, there are hundreds of thousands of educated (not merely instructed) Protestants of every hue and shade, who object to the system on account of its tending to materialism and infidelity, both leading directly to immorality, and in consequence they do not patronize it. Are then the belief and consciences of all these not to be taken into account at all? Would it not be infinitely better, were the State to propose this: "We will collect and hand over to you the tax paid by yourselves, with which money you *must* instruct but may *educate* the children of your own faith. We require all the children to be instructed; you want them also educated according to your views as parents. We will certainly in this free land not force you to support schools by which you cannot benefit, and we stand ready to allow any considerable sect the same privilege, not as a matter of favor, but as a right. Meantime we shall run our own Godless schools for those whom they suit, *but also with their own funds.*"

This is so evidently just that it doubtless would have been done years ago (as it is now done in Savannah, Georgia, and other places in that enlightened State), had it not been for the "*Native American*," "*No Popery*," and "*Know Nothing*" cries, which arose about the time when the real tendency of these schools began to dawn upon the people's minds. Similar cries, reappearing at intervals, have frightened the timorous up to the breaking out of the Civil War. We know how readily the mental perception of statesmen even, much more of the populace, becomes obfuscated by expediency, in view of the temporary howl of the hour, and thus, those who have expressed themselves correctly, recounted in the presence of "Sam," the catchword of ignorant bigots. Those who had not given utterance to their belief, but yet saw the right, counselled in view of the then existing rancor, quiet and delay, and thus this monstrous injustice has been saddled upon the Catholics during one-half a century.

We meet once in a while with sensible and liberal-minded men of the various Protestant denominations, who while admitting the injustice of the enforced law, still evidently think that it is rather a matter of feeling than of principle. With deference to all such as regard the matter in that light, we will say, a Protestant may attend the ministrations of another denomination. He can, and often does, and that too in strict accordance with his Protestant

principles, send his children to a Catholic school or college. Witness the schools of the Jesuits, or those of the Sisters of Charity, or of the many teaching orders. The Catholic, on the contrary, if he be so in any thing but the mere name, violates his conscience by so doing, and ceases to act in accordance with the teachings of the Church. The situation of the Catholic on the subject is very much that of the conscientious Protestant, if required by law, in a Pagan land, to violate one of the Ten Commandments or pay for immunity from said demand. He could assuredly purchase freedom from an unjust vexation. Now the Catholic, in our case, must violate his conscience, were he to send his children to the public schools, if he believes them to be mere nurseries of disbelief in religion and injurious to morals. He pays for immunity by his taxes, which go, unfortunately, to their support, and then he pays once more for the support of his own school in which he has confidence. None but a Catholic can thoroughly appreciate Catholic feeling on this subject, one which appeals to them more strongly than any other except their own personal salvation. In short, Catholics cannot lawfully expose their children to the proximate dangers of a course of non-religious instruction without most powerful safeguards, not readily attained, under a penalty of failing totally in the discharge of their duty as members of Christ's visible Church; and this involves appalling consequences.

However much we may differ as to modes of instruction or subject to be pursued, there are but few God-fearing men in any sect who fail to perceive that coequally with every advance in secular knowledge there should be a corresponding advance in the all-important knowledge of God, our duties towards Him and to our fellow-man. We put it then to all such of whatsoever name, that the injustice is done indirectly to them, though directly to us, who are a unit upon this subject (witness our schools and colleges), and who constitute a numerical majority over all those combined who join with us in opposing this oppressive, inefficient, corrupt and unjust school system. Nearly all the sects of Protestantism tacitly acknowledge by their Sunday-schools the necessity for religious education, and by implication, the inefficiency of the public schools. If they sincerely believe themselves in the right, they cannot fail to desire that their children may be brought up the same way. Now the Sunday-school has proved everywhere to be a very insufficient *suppedaneum* (*seu succedaneum*) to the week-day public school; the amount of bread is lamentably small for such copious sack (*with lenic therein, Hal!*) the antidote is not sufficient to counteract the poison, and their cause, did they but see it, is on this subject identical with our own, as indeed it was in Ireland, for example, though they refused long to see it, on the subject of Church disestablishment or disendowment. We trust and believe that

there are, after all, not many in this country who will imitate the folly of the stupid and bigoted dissenting Orangemen of the North of Ireland, by saying that they would rather submit to an injustice than to have the despised Papists relieved therefrom. It must be, therefore, from apathy, want of zeal, or lack of examination of the subject that our usually kind Protestant brethren have been so backward in putting their shoulders to the work for the removal of this revolting wrong from us both.

We have called it an injustice; it is more. It is a galling tyranny, and there is none more withering than that which violates conscience. Nor will the rights of conscience infringed, cry out always in vain. For some time past it has pleased Almighty God to put a stop to the rabid howls of those insane zealots and knaves combined, who used, from time to time, to sound the tocsin of "None but Americans on guard to-night"! (as if we were not Americans born and bred), "Down with the Pope!" etc.; and consequently the country might now calmly, in view of the justice of the case, pure and simple, ponder over the matter, and gracefully concede that which its inherent equity will ultimately force. It may be, too, the upright concession will come at a time, and with as poor a grace, as did the desuetude of the "penal laws" in England—the Act of Catholic Emancipation—the disestablishment of the Anglicans in Ireland, or that other act of emancipation for which reason and justice called in vain for more than half a century, but which actual self-interest finally and oddly carried! We are certainly not of those who believe in optimism, who expect the millennium one of these fine mornings, or who found large hopes for the speedy winding up of sublunary affairs on the proximate fulfilment of the prophecy concerning the seven-headed and ten-horned beast, or the "*time and times and half a time!*"

But Americans are rational and very keen-sighted people, and we have that confidence in them that we do not think it would be possible, at this late day, to re-enact for example in New York, the history of the Jesuit Father Kaufmann, who was sentenced during colonial times for refusing to divulge what he could only have known through the Sacrament of Penance. We trust, also, that it will soon be possible even in New Hampshire or Connecticut, to hold office without swearing to "support the Protestant religion"; that the experiences of the late war have taught our Protestant brethren, as well as that much more numerous class, who have no religion at all, the *impropriety* of burning convents as at Boston, or churches as at Philadelphia. And finally, we feel confident that this most iniquitous tax will speedily be removed not only from Catholics but from all who feel its continuance an infringement of right. We do not doubt that the time is fast approaching when the State will confine herself to her legitimate duties of the which

there are enough, and those sufficiently onerous, without undertaking to supply us with a secular instruction which we do not want in any other manner than as a hand-maid to religion and, with which, so accompanied, no government *can* furnish us. Were it even possible, such a power is too liable to abuse, to be left in any governmental hands; and finally, upon *parents*, as such, devolves the responsibility for the souls of their offspring, and we dare not even if we could, shift it from where the Almighty has placed it.

The venerable Archbishop Hughes of New York, explains this subject very fully in a series of letters published in the 40's, and his arguments were so clear—his reasoning so cogent and irrefragable, that almost all who took any practical interest in the subject, were convinced that he held the correct grounds, and the object of the present paper is rather to recall the attention of Catholics to the facts and deductions of that lamented Prelate than to enter into the minutiae of the controversy that ensued. Mr. Seward expressed himself publicly and privately as convinced of the justice of the claims of the Church, but at that time Catholics were comparatively few, and a political campaign on *anti-Catholic* principles was just looming up. He shrank therefore, under the circumstances, from maintaining his convictions, and the seed sown by the excellent Archbishop, fell upon stony ground; it was addressed to hearts harder than stone, viz., those of men, mad with political excitement and maddened yet more by the galling reflection that they were wilfully in the wrong. A great change has since that time taken place in the manner in which Catholics as units and Catholicity as a system are regarded by our fellow-citizens not of the Faith. The Church is now a power, small, it is true, as to numbers when compared with the immense hosts of her adversaries, but the armor of her opponents is frail, their weapons broken or blunted—the discipline of the foe is very imperfect—the coherence of the armies almost null. The Church grows; she is ever the same; her trained forces, though small relatively, are more than a match for the discordant hosts of the enemy at variance among themselves, and whose leaders are bitterly jealous of each other. Large numbers the world over, convinced, that in her bosom is salvation, are daily entering her fold, and it would seem from the signs of the times to be the will of God that in this country, at least, and for a while, she should enjoy a season of rest, of peace and tranquillity. But it does not follow that it is the right thing for those who are in authority to become apathetic, or not to use all the means in their power, and put forward all possible efforts for the suppression of such grievous wrongs as still bear heavily upon her, and to prevent the imposition of others, come they in what guise they may.

THOMAS A. BECKER, D.D.

Scientific Chronicle.

AERIAL NAVIGATION.

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

READER, have you ever dreamt of flying? If so, you have been blest; if not, you have missed one of the most glorious experiences of life. With us it has ever been a favorite dream, and sunny reminiscences of it run back almost to the twilight of childhood. And the process is so simple. No extra attachments of wings or feathers are needed; only a flapping, bird-like, movement of the arms, and a frog-like movement of the other extremities, and lo, up and away you go with ease, and with as much grace as may be. In our flights, sometimes hundreds of hissing serpents, sometimes packs of snarling wolves, sometimes howling tigers and roaring lions would become interested in the performance, and savagely cheer us on for miles together, but we never seemed to experience a thought of fear, nor the least dread of losing the wonderful power, nor even the slightest sensation of fatigue.

Over houses and steeples and mountains,
Over valleys and rivers and oceans,
We have floated along in our dreaming
Rejoicing in power and freedom;
As wild as the bird, and as eager,
To drink in the misty, blue ether,
And bathe in the glorious sunshine.

We do not imagine we are exceptions in this matter. Perhaps many, perhaps nearly all, have had similar experiences. However, we have made no inquiries, and so we only answer for ourselves.

Is there now some mystical meaning in all this? Is there in it some shadow of an undefined yearning, beyond the power of science to explain? We do not pretend to know; and if we did know, this is not the place to enlarge upon it. We leave it therefore, to talk prosaic science.

From a physiological point of view, man seems to be pretty well fitted to get through this world by walking; and to be but poorly adapted to imitate the mode of locomotion of either the fish or the bird, not having fins and gills like the one, nor wings and feathers like the other. And yet, since he is monarch of all he surveys, it should not seem strange if he attempted to rival them, even in their own specialties. No doubt, he early acquired the art of swimming; and we know that there are to-day savage tribes who are about as much at home in the water as on the dry land, and who attack the ferocious shark, hand-to-hand, even on his own chosen field of battle. Yet, in a fair swimming contest, nobody would for an instant refuse the first prize to the shark. It is not

in this way that man has acquired his mastery over the seas. Neither is it in this way that he will eventually acquire, beneath the waters, the mastery, which he now has at their surface.

The fish makes use of whatever physical power God has given him, and that's the end of it. Man lays his hand upon the powers of nature, and makes them subservient to his will. From the day when man first crossed some little arm of the sea, on a raft of rough logs, with a rag for a sail, to the day when he stands, a proud speck, on the deck of a monster steamship, the work of his own hands, itself but a speck on the bosom of the boundless deep, he has been struggling for the mastery, and he feels that he almost has it in his hand. No denizen of the ocean, not even the whale, will now dispute it with him, and the great sea-serpent himself seems to have retired from the contest. We have heard nothing of him now for several months.

Turn we now to the other point. If man's physical build renders him ill adapted to play the part of the fish, he would evidently make a still more unlikely bird. In swimming, his whole weight is sustained by the buoyancy of the water, and he has need of muscular effort merely to keep himself right end up, and to propel himself onward. On the other hand, the air supports but a very small fraction of his weight, in fact less than four ounces, for a man of medium size, so that, if he would fly, he must raise practically his whole weight, and this with no more solid support than the air itself. The problem looks hopeless, and yet, from the very earliest times even down to our own days, man has coveted the mastery of the air as well as that of the waters.

It is related that Daedalus and his hopeful son Icarus, having been imprisoned by Minos, King of Crete, made wings for themselves of feathers, cemented them on with wax, and so flew away and escaped. But boys will be boys, and Icarus, boy-like, disobeyed his father's injunction not to fly too high, and soared so far that the heat of the sun melted his wings off, and falling into the sea, he was drowned. The sea and the island of Icaria, named after the boy, are there to this day to bear witness to the truth of the story. Perhaps we are too hard to satisfy, but we hope to be pardoned if we think that the whole affair looks more like a flight of imagination on the part of the poet who relates it, than a real mechanical flight.

According to Suetonius, Simon Magus, in the time of Nero, attempted to fly from the roof of one house to another, but failed in the attempt, and was killed by the fall. There is no intrinsic impossibility in this, and so we let it pass. Again, during the middle ages, many attempts were made at flying, by means of artificial wings, but they all seem to have ended in disaster. The only case with which we are acquainted, which was a decided success every time, was Mother Goose's Old Lady, who used regularly to go up on a broom and sweep the cobwebs from the sky. But alas, the modern scientist refuses to believe even this.

Seriously speaking, we are fully convinced that man, as we know him, is not able, and never will be able, to fly by purely muscular effort, no matter how many wings and feathers he may take unto himself. Birds

do it, but, weight for weight, birds are many times stronger than the strongest men. Notwithstanding this, a certain number of men have been discussing for years past, in scientific journals the mechanism of the flight of birds, with the ultimate end of learning to fly themselves. Each one of them is perfectly sure in his own mind, that he knows all about it; but we modestly confess that we understand none of them, and never hope to. Let us see one of these gentlemen put his knowledge in practice and soar aloft on his borrowed pinions, and, at the same time, let us be reasonably convinced that the devil is not at the bottom of it all, then we will begin to believe in the possibility of human flight. No, if ever man succeeds in navigating the air it will not be by his muscular power, but by means of machinery. This, indeed, was sufficiently proved by Borelli, more than two hundred years ago, and if any one were found at the present day still clinging to the old idea, we would certainly hold his sanity in very serious doubt.

Machine flying is therefore the next in order, and the first thought that seems to have taken hold on the minds of men, in connection with this idea, was, that if some means could be found of being buoyed up on the air, as a vessel is on the water, then locomotion and steering would easily follow, and so the whole problem would be solved. Various means to this end have at different times, been proposed, some good enough in principle but impossible of practical realization, some bad all around. Queer indeed are the explanations given at times of the expected results.

Albert of Saxony, a monk of the order of St. Augustine, thought that, as fire, according to Aristotle, is more attenuated than air, and floats above our atmosphere, if a light hollow globe were filled with that substance, it would rise to a certain height and remain suspended. Caspar Scott, a Jesuit, adopted substantially the same speculation; only he proposed to replace the fire by the thin, distant, ethereal blueness which he believed floated above the air. He never succeeded in laying in a stock of this useful substance, and the project failed in consequence.

Again, it was believed that the dew was of celestial origin, being shed by the stars, and that it was drawn up to heaven in the course of the day by the heat of the sun. Hence it was thought that hen's eggs, filled with morning dew and exposed to the heat of the sun would ascend to the sky, and, at nightfall descend to the earth. So, with a sufficient number of these and a suitable car, a man could dine above the clouds and return to earth for supper. We do not find that it ever occurred to the people of those days that it would be just as well to drink the morning dew and dispense with both car and egg shells? Neither can we find out why hen's eggs in particular were chosen at a time when geese were so abundant. This will probably ever remain a blank among the pages of history.

Another scheme, similar to that of Father Scott, but a little more definite, was put forward, as late as 1755, by Joseph Galien, a Dominican. He was a professor of philosophy and theology at Avignon, and spent his spare moments in dreaming about flying-machines. He wanted to

collect, not the fire nor the ether, but the thin air of the upper regions, and enclose it in a vessel extending more than a mile every way and intended to carry fifty-four times as much weight as did Noah's ark. Truly, this was a grand idea, vast, majestical, chimerical. These will suffice as specimens of a list of the interminable fables and follies and rubbish under which this business was buried for centuries.

Somewhat better than these, because it contained at least one true principle, was the suggestion of Francis Lana, a Jesuit, whose works were published at Brescia in 1670. Torricelli in 1643 had shown how a vacuum might be produced by means of mercury or water in tubes, and Lana, taking the hint, reasoned that since there is nothing lighter than nothingness, a light vessel *filled with that*, would have a great ascensional force. He therefore planned a machine after the following fashion: make four hollow balls of copper, each 25 feet in diameter and $\frac{2}{25}$ of an inch in thickness. Attach them by vertical rods above the corners of a basket about 75 feet square, and then exhaust them of air by Torricelli's method. A mast carrying a spare-sail is to be planted in the middle of the basket.

Lana made all his calculations very nicely, whence it resulted that the ascensional force of the four balls together would be from 1100 to 1200 pounds. This would be quite enough to raise the basket, sail and several passengers. The plan never got beyond the paper on which it was described. Its weak point was in this, that when exhausted of air, each ball would have to sustain an atmospheric pressure, tending to crush it, of over 2000 tons. Lana himself saw the difficulty, but he thought that a truly spherical form would enable the balls to sustain even that enormous pressure. Doubtlessly it would, but who ever saw or heard tell of a *perfectly* spherical shell? No sane mechanic, even at the present day, would undertake to make one, especially of such a size. There is, of course, no intrinsic impossibility in it, any more than there is in balancing a sewing needle on its point on the edge of a razor, but we can safely predict that no one will ever succeed in doing either. More than that; for even if it were possible to build such a shell, it would be totally impossible to keep it in shape when built, unless it were kept afloat in a perfectly calm atmosphere. If it touched the earth, or came in contact with anything whatever, it would become slightly deformed, and then the external pressure would do the rest, that is, crush and crumple it like an empty paper bag. The idea, however, of making a body rise in the air by giving it a less specific gravity, as a whole, than the air itself, was perfectly correct, but the means proposed were altogether impractical and inadequate.

One would have thought that the world might have learned something in the course of two hundred years, and yet, within the last four years a gentleman of New Jersey, actually brought Lana's project forward again, only on a more gigantic scale. He was to build a cylinder 100 feet in diameter and 500 feet long, the ends being conical. It was to be of steel, not thicker than the paper of this REVIEW, and when exhausted of air would have an ascensional force of about 145 tons. It

was said that the United States Government had appropriated \$75,000 to carry on the experiment. We cannot vouch for all the statements made to us, but we remember predicting humbly at the time, that the project would come to grief, and we were informed later on that such was the case. We need not be surprised at that, when we bear in mind that the cylinder would have to support a pressure, tending to crush it, of something like 185,000 tons.

It is time now to leave the region of chimeras and turn to what was rewarded with at least a partial success. The credit of launching the first balloon is due to Stephen and Joseph Montgolfier, sons of a celebrated paper-maker of Annonay, about forty miles from Lyons, in France. They had observed the suspension of clouds in the atmosphere, and it occurred to them that if they could enclose any vapor of the nature of a cloud in a light bag, it might rise and carry the bag with it into the air. They therefore made paper bags, nearly spherical in form, with a circular opening underneath. These they held over a fire of straw, so as to allow the smoke to enter the bags, when much to their delight, the bags rose and floated in the air of the room.

Feeling sure of their ground, they now determined to give a public exhibition on a large scale. Accordingly they made a bag of linen, for greater strength, and lined it with paper the better to keep in the smoke. It was about 35 feet in diameter and weighed 500 pounds. They supported it in its collapsed condition by a string from an outrigger, inflated it over a fire made by burning bundles of chopped straw, and when they found it was beginning to ascend they cut the string and let it go. It rose rapidly to about a mile in height, floated away for a couple of miles and then slowly descended, having been in the air about ten minutes. This was the invention of the balloon. It does not detract from the credit due to the Montgolfiers, on the contrary it rather adds to it, that millions of others had seen clouds floating in the atmosphere, and might have invented the balloon. The fact is that they didn't, whereas Stephen and Joseph Montgolfier did, and in that lies all the difference. However, they were woefully astray as to the cause of the phenomenon. They imagined, it seems, that the balloon ascended on account of some power inherent in the smoke, and it was not till quite a while afterwards that the true cause was recognized, viz., the lightness of the heated air in the balloon as compared with an equal volume of the cooler air outside. All gases, air included, expand on being heated, and consequently become rarefied, and will therefore tend to ascend when surrounded by a denser atmosphere. The amount of ascensional force will be precisely the difference between the weight of a given volume of the rarer and that of the same volume of the denser gas. If their difference be sufficiently great, the rarefied air in the balloon will not only tend to ascend itself, but will be able to carry a certain amount of dead weight with it, as the material of the balloon and its appendages. In the Montgolfiers' first balloon no source of heat was taken up, and hence the air inside was rapidly cooled by radiation and the balloon could not long remain suspended. The exhibition spoken of above

took place at Annonay on June 5, 1783, in presence of quite a large concourse of people, whose enthusiasm naturally knew no bounds. The news of this event spread rapidly over Europe and even to America, and ballooning soon became the fashion of the day.

About two months later, the two Robert brothers built a balloon with the intention of repeating at Paris the experiment of the Montgolfiers. They made it of silk, and varnished it with a solution of elastic gum, the better to keep in the smoke. It was about 13 feet in diameter. Before proceeding to the experiment however, they luckily consulted James A. Charles, Professor of Physics in Paris, and he persuaded them to fill their balloon with hydrogen. This gas had been discovered but a few years before, and was not much known outside of the laboratory. The Robert brothers agreed to the proposal, and on August 27, 1783, an immense concourse of people assembled, filling every available spot on and around the Champ de Mars. At 5 o'clock P.M., at a signal given by the discharge of a cannon, the balloon was set free. It rose to the height of three-quarters of a mile, remained in the air nearly an hour, and fell at a distance of fifteen miles from the starting point. The peasants who saw it fall were terrified, but valiant in the midst of their fears, they attacked the monster and having gained the usual signal victory, tore the balloon to shreds. Hydrogen was at that time called "inflammable air," and hence balloons of the Charles type have frequently been called "air-balloons," while the Montgolfier kind have naturally been known as "fire-balloons."

It was not apparent at first which would turn out to be the better kind, and so each inventor had his adherents, and experimented with his own invention. On the 19th of September, 1783, Joseph Montgolfier repeated at Versailles, in presence of the king, the queen, the court and the plebeian spectators, the experiment of Annonay. This time, below the balloon was suspended a cage, containing a sheep, a cock and a duck, emblems of gentleness, self-conceit, and contented mediocrity. They rose 1500 feet, made a voyage of two miles and landed in safety. To them belongs the honor of being the first aerial travellers, but their impressions have not been recorded.

It was soon seen that no real use could be made of the fire-balloon unless some means were employed to feed the fire while in the air. They therefore constructed a light furnace, and laid in a supply of the inevitable straw, but a stoker was yet wanting, until a young naturalist named Francois Pilatre de Rozier, offered his services. He was generously accepted, and after making sundry preliminary experiments with a captive balloon (a balloon held by a rope), he concluded to try a free flight. A friend, the Marquis d'Arlandes accompanied him, the ascent being made on November 21, 1783. They rose 500 feet, and in 25 minutes, having used up all their fuel, descended quietly, at a distance of 25 miles from the starting point.

It was Charles' turn next, and just ten days later he was ready with a new hydrogen balloon, 27 feet in diameter. In company with one of the Roberts, he ascended from Paris, rose to an elevation of 2000 feet,

and after a voyage of two hours descended at Nesle, 27 miles from Paris.

The contest between the two kinds of balloons was now fairly started, and so the next thing in order was to do something gigantic. On January 19, 1784, the largest fire balloon ever made ascended from Lyons. It was over 100 feet in diameter and 130 feet high. Seven persons made the ascent together, among whom was Joseph Montgolfier. They fed the fire as usual with straw, and succeeded in rising to a height of over 3000 feet, but a rent in the upper part of the balloon obliged them to descend sooner than they had intended. This is the only record of an ascent by Joseph Montgolfier, and it is not known that Stephen ever attempted it at all.

Already in 1783. Rittenhouse and Hopkins, of the Philosophical Academy of Philadelphia, had been experimenting on the use of gas for inflating balloons, and finally constructed a machine consisting of 47 small hydrogen balloons, attached to a cage. Jos. Wilcox, a plucky carpenter in their employ, offered to make the ascent. It was a business transaction, and he was careful to secure his pay in advance, because he knew that if he were killed he would not be likely to get it at all. The experiment was quite successful, though the journey was short, for the air-current having changed direction, he found himself approaching the river; so he made incisions in some of the balloons, and effected his descent in safety.

From this time onward many ascents were made in different countries, but after a number of fatal accidents with the fire-balloon, its use was abandoned. The first of these was the death of Rozier himself and of his companion, Romain. Blanchard, a Frenchman, and Jeffries, an American, had crossed the English channel together from Dover to Calais. Rozier intended to cross in the opposite direction from Boulogne to the English coast. To make more certain of sufficient ascensional power, he used both a hydrogen and a fire-balloon, the latter being underneath the former. At a height of 3000 feet, the whole contrivance took fire, and the unlucky adventurers fell on the rocks near the sea-shore and were dashed to pieces. The next victim was Count Zambeccari, an Italian. He was the first to send up a balloon from English ground, in November, 1783. He shortly afterwards returned to his own country where he devoted himself to ballooning, made many ascents, fell twice into the Adriatic Sea, and had several other hair-breadth escapes. Finally, descending in a fire-balloon, in company with Signor Bonaga, September 21, 1812, his grapnel caught in a tree, the shock caused the balloon to take fire, and to save themselves both voyagers leaped to the ground. Bonaga was maimed for life, but Zambeccari was killed on the spot.

Take it all in all the number of serious accidents has not been very great. The number of Englishmen alone, who have made balloon ascents is probably over 2000; we have no record at hand for other countries, but as the original inventors, the French, have adhered to the practise with more persistency than any other people, and as it has been

tried more or less in all countries, the total number of those who have made ascents cannot fall short of 6000 or 7000. Of this number many have ascended hundreds of times. We cannot find an account of more than twenty fatal accidents, and a large percentage of these was due to the fire-balloon or to gross carelessness. With the hydrogen balloon, or its successor, the coal-gas-balloon, accidents have been relatively rare.

What now has been the outcome of all this? To tell the truth, very little. It was thought at the beginning that the air surrounding the earth was only three or four miles deep, and that a balloon might rise to the surface and sail, as a ship on the water. This is why Lana and others fitted sails to their balloons; this is why others again took up oars and rudders. They seemed strangely to forget that men could not live without air, or perhaps they imagined that the ether or their fluid or whatever was up there would supply its place. A hundred years of experience has about convinced the world that a balloon must float *in*, not *on* the atmosphere, and that consequently whatever be its form, be it rigged with sails, or left sailless, be it fitted with a rudder, or left rudderless, it can only drift about at the mercy of every stray wind, and that it can no more be steered than you can steer a cloud.

The results obtained amount to a few haphazard voyages, a few observations on temperatures, a few happy escapes from beleagured towns, a few attempts to make use of it in military operations, and the inane admiration of gaping crowds on gala days. But as to fulfilling the expectations of those who thought the mastery of the air was already within easy reach, ballooning has proved a sad failure, and we have given up looking for any further real advance in that direction by its means.

If indeed there were some motive power attached to the balloon, capable of giving it a forward motion, independently of the wind, then it might be guided at will. This has been tried and has proved practically useless. In order to have a sufficient ascensional power, a balloon must be very large, and therefore expose such a large surface to the action of the wind, that it would require an enormous power to hold it against even a very moderate breeze. No power known would be of any avail in the case of a high wind, much less in a real storm. This has come to be so generally recognized that balloonists, for some time past, have been trying to devise some better form than the old-fashioned pear-shaped monstrosity. The form which would seem perhaps best suited for the purpose is that of a long cylinder, pointed at the ends, and carrying a car under nearly its whole length. A large, light, propelling screw could be fitted either at the bow or the stern, and rudders arranged for both lateral and vertical steering. A good deal of experimenting has been done in this direction, especially in France, but the results are rather discouraging. The form is indeed much better suited than the old one to independent navigation, but the enormous surface exposed to the wind remains as an insurmountable objection. In a perfectly calm atmosphere it would do pretty well, and indoor experiments, on a small scale, have been successful; but the outside at-

mosphere is rarely calm, and, in our climates at least, is never to be relied on for any length of time. The idea of navigating the air by means of balloons will therefore probably have to be abandoned, and we will probably have to adopt in the end a totally different system.

The one which is now pushing its way to the front is this: to construct a machine of wood and metal, many times heavier than the air, and supplied with a motive power capable of raising the machine and of propelling it onward at the same time. There are reliable indications that it is indeed coming, and its advent may not be so far away as is generally thought.

For some time past two men especially, each eminently qualified for the task, have been thinking and experimenting on the subject, and their results have recently been made public. These are Professor S. P. Langley of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington, and the well-known and successful inventor, Hiram S. Maxim. A few words about what they have accomplished will not be out of place here.

Professor Langley did not propose to invent a complete flying machine, but only to determine experimentally how much power would be required to hold up a given weight in the air, by means of a plane propelled forward, and set at a greater or less angle with the horizontal. If this were definitely settled, we could then judge whether or not the art of navigating the air is within the reach of our present means. The experiments were made with great care, and with every necessary attention to detail. They are described in a quarto volume of 115 pages with the aid of a number of large plates and smaller cuts.

In an introductory chapter, Professor Langley says: "These researches have led to the result that mechanical sustentation of heavy bodies in the air, combined with very great speed, is not only possible, but within the reach of mechanical means we actually possess, and while they are not meant to demonstrate the art of guiding such heavy bodies in flight, they do show that we have now the power to sustain and propel them. Further than this, these new experiments (and theory also when reviewed in their light), show that if in such aerial motion, there be given a plane of fixed size and weight, inclined at such an angle, and moved forward at such a speed, that it shall be sustained in horizontal flight, then the more rapid the motion is, the *less* will be the power required to sustain and advance it that is, one horse-power thus employed, will transport a larger weight at 20 miles an hour than at 10, a still larger at 40 miles than at 20 and so on up to some remote limit and not yet attained in experiment." This is a most astonishing assertion; yet there seems to be no doubt but that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated.

The method of experimentation was by means of a gigantic whirling machine, located on the grounds of the Allegheny Observatory, Allegheny, Pa. The machine consists essentially of an upright post about eight feet high, carrying two revolving arms each 30 feet long. These arms are made to revolve horizontally by an underground connection with a steam engine; the speed can be urged to such an extent that the outer ends of the arms will travel at the rate of 100 miles an hour. To

these arms are fixed various attachments, the first of which is called the "suspended plane." This a brass plate, one foot square, and weighing two pounds. It is hung vertically, by a coiled spring, in a guide-frame, in which it is free to move up and down, a measureable distance. Light rollers are arranged so as to render sliding movement as nearly frictionless as possible. The guide-frame itself is pivoted at exactly half its height to two standards, which in turn are fastened to the outer end of the revolving arm. When the arm is at rest, the guide-frame and suspended plane hang vertically, and the spring registers two pounds. When the arm is set in motion and the suspended plane therefore forced forward, the resistance of the air causes the plane to take up a position more or less inclined to the vertical, according as the motion is greater or less, and its position for every rate of speed is registered automatically on a card, by the trace of a pencil point. Under these conditions the "plane" exerts no pressure on the guide-frame, but the whole force, both that due to the weight of the "plane" and that due to the wind of advance, is borne by the spring. One might therefore expect that the spring would be further extended than when at rest. The exact contrary is the fact, the spring being contracted and the contraction being the greater, according as the spread itself is greater. This gives us the first hint that the *greater* the speed, the *less* the power required to maintain a body in horizontal flight, for it must be remembered that the only force which holds up that "suspended plane" and drags it along, is the tension of the spring.

This being satisfactorily settled, another piece of apparatus is introduced. It has been named the "plane dropper," and consists of a rectangular frame about two feet wide by five feet high. It is securely fastened by the middle of one of its longer sides to the outer end of the whirling arm. On the opposite side of this rectangle, a sliding piece of aluminum runs up and down, the friction being eliminated as nearly as possible by delicate ebonite rollers. To this sliding piece are clamped two rectangular planes, one on each side of the upright guide. Their size and weight are accurately determined, and they may be set at any angle with the horizontal from 0° to 45° . All the minute details of the experiment being made ready, the whirling arm is set in motion, with the result that when the speed is sufficiently great, the force of gravity is entirely overcome by the air-pressure on the planes, and they rise along the guide rod. By proper attention and delicate adjustment of the speed of rotation the planes might be made to remain at a given height, neither mounting further nor yet descending. It is found that the speed necessary for this depends on the weight of the planes, on the extent of their surface, on the proportion between their length and width, and on the angle which they make with the horizontal. After a long series of careful experiments had been made and compared together, and many ingenious methods of measuring the various pressures and resistances devised, and every imaginable source of error allowed for, the principal conclusions arrived at are the following:

1. A horizontal plane will fall more slowly in the air, if at the same

time it be endowed with a horizontal motion than if let fall vertically, and this retardation is greater, the greater the horizontal velocity.

2. It requires a greater effort to support a flying machine in the air, when it is at rest relatively to the air, than when it is moving horizontally; and as this horizontal motion becomes greater and greater, the effort needed becomes less and less.

3. It actually requires less power to maintain a high horizontal speed (and support the body) than it does to maintain a less speed.

4. While an engine, developing one horse-power, can transport 200 pounds at the rate of 45 miles an hour, such an engine (boiler and all complete) can now be built to weigh less than one-tenth of that amount. From Prof. Langley's standpoint, then, the outlook for aerial navigation seems remarkably favorable.

We have already trespassed so far on the space allotted to us that we shall be obliged to treat Mr. Maxim's invention very briefly. His own published account consists of only six or seven ordinary pages, exclusive of the illustrations. His method of experimenting has not all the details and fine points of Prof. Langley's, but it is practical and goes straight to the point.

He too erected a whirling arm, to the outer end of which he attached a flying machine, all complete except the engine and boiler. This machine consists of an elongated metal body, through which passes a shaft carrying on its outer end a light screw, somewhat similar in form to the screw of a steamship. Fastened above this is a thin "plane" 12 feet 10 inches long and 2 feet 2 inches wide, the long edge in front. With suitable shafting through the upright post and along the arm, the screw is put in connection with a stationary engine below, and by its revolutions drives itself and the revolving arm around a circumference of 200 feet. Now with this machine and various appliances for measuring the work of the engine, the thrust of the screw, the resistances of friction and pressures, Mr. Maxim finds, just as Prof. Langley did, that the higher the speed, the less would be the power required. He finds, moreover, that one horse-power will support and carry forward from 133 to 250 pounds, according to the speed and the angle which the plane makes with the horizontal, thus confirming Prof. Langley's statements on every point. He concludes from this that if a motor were made to generate one horse-power for every 100 pounds of its own weight, a machine might be made to successfully navigate the air. He next describes a new motor of his own invention which he claims will do much better than that, and he feels almost sure of success, and adds that even if he personally does fail, some one else will succeed, and that the art of navigating the air will be an accomplished fact within the next ten years. The way seems pretty clear ahead, and, old as we are, we hope by behaving well, to live to see *the dream of a lifetime come true.* .

NOTES.

1. *A New Diving Dress* has lately been invented and patented in England by Col. W. Carey, which has several points of superiority over those heretofore in use. Garments for the use of divers, though protecting the body perfectly from contact with the water, do not protect it from the pressure which the water exerts, and this pressure, even at moderate depths, is not only a great inconvenience, but may result sooner or later in positive injury. The dress designed by Col. Carey is intended to resist this pressure, being however sufficiently flexible at the joints to allow perfect freedom of movement. It has besides, buoyancy enough not only to carry its own weight, but also that of the diver, who is therefore obliged to be weighted in order to sink and remain below. This at first sight might look like a disadvantage, yet such is not the case. It is a decided advantage, since it renders the diver less dependent on aid from above. In case of danger from whatever cause he can slip the weight and rise to the surface, without waiting to signal his desire to be hauled up. The new garment has been named the "Crustacean Dress," being, as it were, an imitation of the every-day, working clothes of the crab, the lobster and such things. If ever we engage in the diving business we shall certainly take care to be provided with the new dress, and we advise our friends to do likewise.

2. *A Monster Pumping-Engine* has lately been completed and tested in Omaha, Nebraska. It has satisfactorily fulfilled the promises made for it of pumping 18,000,000 gallons a day, against a head of 310 feet. The stroke of the piston is five feet, the total height of the machine fifty-three feet; it weighs 1100 tons, and cost \$150,000, a pretty respectable price, and more than most people would care to pay for a mere pump. Omaha ought to be satisfied now, one would think. She has, besides the machine just mentioned, a "Holly" pumping engine, capable of delivering 14,000,000 gallons daily. With a population of about 140,000 she manages to use up 16,000,000 gallons of water (the amount of other liquids not stated) every twenty-four hours, which amounts to nearly 115 gallons on an average for each individual. Her two engines are capable of delivering just twice that quantity, so there is little danger of scarcity "as long as the river flows," the muddy Missouri, to wit. Speaking of the Missouri reminds us that before being fit for use all this water has to undergo a thorough system of purification. The magnitude of this part of the work will be understood when it is remembered that each day's supply carries with it 100,000 pounds of mud, all of which has to be extracted before the water is delivered to the city mains, and it is done successfully.

Water is a great blessing when it gets its legitimate use; in fact, the degree of civilization of a country might be gauged almost to a nicety by the amount of water used for lavatory purposes. The Great Unwashed never accomplished anything permanent in the history of the race, and we congratulate Omaha that she has recognized this fact, and given her citizens the means of taking another long stride onward and upward.

The Omaha Pumping Engine was designed by Mr. Irving H. Reynolds, a promising engineer, not yet 30 years of age. On the occasion of the public trial of the engine, the good people of the city gave him a grand ovation in the grand western way, and after talking and shouting themselves hoarse over water and pumps in general, and Omaha water and pumps in particular, they vociferously called on Mr. Reynolds to make a speech. He did so and his harangue which was justly considered the most eloquent one of the occasion we give entire. "The Engine speaks for itself; I have nothing to add."

3. It is announced that a great government work has been completed, that is, the survey of the Pacific Coast of the United States. As all the navigable waters of the country belong to the general government, the work of the survey naturally devolved on Federal engineers and officers. There is every reason to believe then that the work has been done as carefully and thoroughly as its importance demands. This means that our whole coast line on the Pacific, with its all its bays and inlets and harbors, has been carefully measured and mapped out; that the latitude and longitude at every point have been determined, as well as the positions of headlands, bluffs, rocks, shoals and islands. The ocean bed itself plotted by soundings extending from low water mark to a sufficient distance beyond the outmost rocks and shoals, and incidentally the character of the bottom, whether muddy, sandy or rocky, noted. This may all be commonplace enough, but it has called for a good deal of patience, perseverance and skill.

Nearly a whole generation has been swept away and a new one has come to take its place since this work was begun, just twenty years ago, but the results will endure for the benefit of many a generation yet unborn.

The great naturalist, Agassiz, was on board the first steamer, the *Hassler*, engaged in this work, and was afforded an opportunity to make a systematic series of deep-sea dredgings all along the coast of South as well as North America, a work which, perhaps more than any other has contributed much to our knowledge of the deep-sea fauna of the Pacific.

The recent surveys have brought to light one fact not generally known, viz., that at Southern California the coast is much more abrupt than at any other portion of North America. At a distance of a mile or even less from the shore, the depth of the water has been found to be fully 600 feet, whereas this depth is reached at other points of the Atlantic and Pacific coast only at a distance of from 25 to 100 miles off shore. This was not known when we first conned our lessons in geography, and so, one by one the idols of our youth are broken.

4. According to the latest scientific journals, another smokeless powder has just been invented which claims to be the best yet invented. It comes from Sweden as a black shining powder with prismatic grains; it has been named *apryrite*. It has been subjected to severe tests by Swedish engineers, and their report is exceedingly favorable. Among other things, it may be heated with safety to a temperature at which other

smokeless powders would be dangerous, or which would at least be injurious to the qualities of the powders themselves. This property renders it very valuable for use in rapid-firing machine guns, which necessarily become very hot in action. It does not tend to cake when stored in large quantities, and this too is an especially good point. In firing it heats the gun-barrels much less than ordinary gunpowder, and very much less than nitro-glycerine powder. It does not foul the piece to any serious extent in firing, nor does it cause corrosion when the barrel is left for a long time uncleansed. Percussion will not cause it to explode. The exact composition is of course kept as secret as possible, but it seems to be a species of nitro-cellulose containing a large proportion of nitrogen. It is said to give high initial velocities with moderate pressures. If all these claims are substantiated in use, *apryite* will be a valuable addition to the arguments of fighting peoples, and a dangerous rival to all other explosive powders in use.

5. We were told long, long ago, that frogs were "amphibious," and we made then and there a mental picture of that word in connection with "frog." Whenever we meet a frog we see it again, so that it is easy to recall it now. The word, all jointed like a museum skeleton, not frog colored, but white, seemed to be standing near the little brook, and when we said "Shoo!" it swayed backwards and forwards a few times and then, turning a complete somersault, fell into the brook and disappeared. After a few seconds, however, it reappeared near the opposite side, this time all frog, color, croak and everything, the mild and sly, but cautious wink included. Then began our first study of the laws of projectiles. Ah!

When therefore we read recently that a Frenchman, of Marseilles, had invented an amphibious velocipede, it is not strange that the old image came back, and that the frog, the Frenchman, the "amphibious" and the velocipede got somewhat mixed. We are going to try to disentangle them.

As you have guessed, the machine is intended for both land and water travel. It differs from an ordinary velocipede in this that the wheels, instead of being made with spokes, are short hollow cylinders. When the machine enters the water, the wheels by their buoyancy, support it together with the rider. Attached to the sides of the wheels are copper paddles which serve as propellers, and with these a fairly active man is said to be capable of making from three to four miles an hour. With improvements contemplated in the size and form of the paddles it is expected that a speed of about six miles an hour will be obtained. How the machine is to be steered and kept on an even keel is not stated, though there should not be much difficulty about that. It has already been found useful for the rescue of persons from drowning.

On the land it will naturally appear somewhat ungainly, as water-fowl generally do, yet it is reported as making very good speed, and taking it on a mixed run, land and water included, it would be far more useful than any mere land craft. Success to the "amphibious velocipede."

6. Now that the winter is upon us it is at least a consolation to know that an efficient machine has been invented for keeping our electric railroad tracks clear of snow. According to the *Engineering Magazine* an electric snow-sweeper, that is to say, a snow-sweeper driven by an electric motor, has been put upon the market by a manufacturing company in St. Paul, Minn. A feature of this sweeper is, that while the machine is driven along the track of an electric railway by a motor of 30 horse-power, taking its current through the trolley wire, the two sweeping brushes are each driven by an independent motor, and all the three motors are reversible. It is stated that this plow is competent to remove from a track snow having a depth of from three to twelve inches, while running at a speed of from four to ten miles an hour. The independent action of the brush motors enables them, when necessary, to be run at a high speed while the plow is moved slowly along the track, and thus to cut away hard, compacted snow, or drifts. It is stated that this machine was thoroughly tested last winter and its effectiveness thereby completely demonstrated.

The next thing in order would be to give us an effective machine to keep the streets of our eastern cities clean in summer.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

L'EVANGÉLISATION DE L'AMÉRIQUE AVANT CHRISTOPHE COLOMB. Par *M. le Dr. Luka Jelic.* Paris, Alphonse Picard, 82 Rue Bonaparte : Paris. 1891.

This is an essay that was read at one of the sessions of the International Scientific Congress of Catholics, held in Paris, from the 1st to the 6th of last April.

After stating the ancient tradition concerning the existence of a continent beyond the Atlantic Ocean—a tradition of the Egyptians, of the Greeks, and of the Middle Ages—the author speaks of the voyage of St. Brandan and his Irish monks in the sixth century in search of a continent beyond the Atlantic Ocean ; of the unsuccessful efforts made afterwards to rediscover these transatlantic islands, which are mentioned by Honorius of Autun (1112-1137), and by Gervaise of Tilbury (1211), the geographers, and found on the maps of the Middle Ages ; he shows that the continent of America was colonized by the Northmen at the beginning of the tenth century. The Scandinavian Sagas prove that Greenland was known to the Northmen from Norway at the end of the ninth, and was colonized by them before the end of the tenth century ; that Hilluland, Markland, Vineland, and Hvitramannaland, were colonized in the eleventh century, and these countries were converted to Christianity at that time. He confines his history of Christianity in America, before Columbus, to the history of the diocese of Gardar, which comprised Greenland and the northeastern part of America.

The Scandinavian Sagas attribute the discovery and colonization of Greenland to the Northmen Gunnbjorn (887), and Eric the Red (983) ; the discovery and colonization of the coasts of northeast America to Bjarn Heriulfson (986), and Leif the Lucky (1001). The Sagas tell us, that the conversion of Greenland to Christianity was due to St. Olaf, the Great, king of Norway (1015-1030). This testimony of the Sagas is confirmed by a Bull of Pope Nicholas V., of the date 1448, in which he speaks of the existing tradition to that effect, which had been communicated to him by the Greenlanders themselves. Our author gives a copy of this Bull in his Appendix.

As to the date of the introduction of Christianity on the American continent, we have only vague indications. In 1050, the Saxon bishop Jason went as far as Vineland, and suffered martyrdom there. In 1112 or 1113, Eric-Upsi an Irishman, was consecrated bishop for America, and preached the gospel to the natives of the continent. In 1121, he went to Vineland, and determined not to return to Greenland, in order to give his entire attention to the evangelization of this new country. As to the success of his work, the Vatican archives give abundant testimony in the reports made to Rome of the collections of Peter Pence taken up by the bishop in the diocese of Gardar ; for such collections were based on the number of families, and therefore in 1327 there must have been at least one thousand Catholic families in the diocese, judging from the report made to Rome for that year. Another proof is contained in the letters of Christian Le Clerq, a missionary for twelve years amongst the Indians of Gaspésia (in our day Acadia and Nova Scotia) in the seventeenth century ; he speaks of the tribe called "Porte Croix," of their traditions taken from the Bible ; of their prayer, which was a corruption of the "Our Father" ; of the Cross, the venerated object

of their worship, placed by them on their graves, worn on their dress, cut on their furniture.

The colonies of Greenland, by a regulation of Benedict IX. (1044), were subject to the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, which comprised all the northern countries of Europe; they were under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishop of Iceland. After Eric-Upsi had decided to remain in Vineland, and not to return to Greenland, the colonists then held a diet, in 1123, and petitioned that Greenland might be erected into an episcopal see. Not having the requisite number of inhabitants to constitute a diocese, still, by reason of its distance from Europe, the petition was granted. The first bishop, Arnold, was chosen in 1124, consecrated by the Archbishop of Lund, and fixed his see at Gardar, in 1126. For some years the new see remained subject to the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen.

When the ecclesiastical province of Norway was established, in 1148, by Pope Eugene III., Gardar was attached to it as one of its suffragan sees, the province being that of Drontheim; and thus we find from the middle of the twelfth century, the diocese of Gardar always mentioned in the *Provinciale Vetus* of Albinus, 1183, in the *Liber censuum* of Cencius Camerarius, 1192, and, later on, in the *Libri Taxarum*.

The preaching of the Crusades, and the collections taken up by the Popes all over Christendom, in furtherance of that object, after the second half of the thirteenth century, furnish us with many documents concerning this diocese of Gardar. In 1261, the Norwegian bishop, Olaf, induced the Greenlanders to contribute both men and money to the deliverance of the Holy Land, and from that time we have frequent notices of the collection of the tithes and Peter Pence. In 1276, the Archbishop of Drontheim, who had been appointed the official collector of the Holy See, petitioned Pope John XXI. to be dispensed from taking up the collection in Gardar, affirming that it would take him five years to fulfil that mission. In 1279, Pope Nicholas III. gave the archbishop extraordinary powers to delegate clerics to take up such collections in the diocese of Gardar. From a Bull of Martin IV., in 1282, we know that the Peter Pence was paid in hides of cattle, seal skins, and whales' teeth, which was exchanged for money in Norway. These cattle-hides must have come from the continent further south.

After the Council of Vienne, 1311, a general collection was ordered, and the bishop of Gardar, Arnius, returned to his see, in 1315, to take it up. From that date down to 1418, we have frequent mention of the diocese of Gardar, and from the increase of the collection, as given in the fiscal books of the Holy See, we can judge of the increase of its Catholic population.

In 1418, Greenland was invaded by savages from the American continent, who pillaged and burnt all its towns and made captives of its inhabitants. Only nine churches, in the interior, escaped destruction. Thirty years after, the Greenlanders managed to return to their native land, rebuilt as best they could some of their churches, and begged of Pope Nicholas V. to send them a bishop and some priests to care for their souls. They informed the Pope of the destruction of their homes, the massacre of their priests, and the sufferings they had endured for thirty years in captivity on the continent. The Pope listened to their prayers, and in 1448 commanded the bishop of Hola and Skalhoft to restore religion in Greenland; but, for unknown reasons, the Pope's decision was not carried out. Fifty years elapsed, when the Greenlanders renewed their petition for spiritual aid to Pope Innocent VIII. Their situation was most deplorable. Abandoned to themselves for

almost a century, without bishops, without priests to instruct them, without the Sacraments, they had almost forgotten the faith of their fathers. The only memorial of that faith which they had been able to preserve, was a corporal, which was every year exposed publicly for the veneration of the people; on that corporal, a hundred years before, the last priest in Greenland had consecrated the Body and Blood of our Lord. Moved by their touching appeal, Alexander VI., who had succeeded Innocent VIII., sent to the see of Gardar, Matthias, a Benedictine, who had been made bishop by his predecessor. He was a man filled with holy zeal for the salvation of the poor Greenlanders. This was the very year that hailed with wonder the news of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus (1492).

We have given a very full digest of this interesting pamphlet. It is enriched by numerous citations from historical documents and manuscripts, and, as an appendix, gives besides the list of the archiepiscopal province of Norway, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, the Bulls of Pope Nicholas V. and Alexander VI. concerning the re-establishment of the diocese of Gardar in Greenland.

THE LIFE OF FATHER HECKER. By Rev. Walter Elliott. New York: The Columbus Press. 1891.

A life of Father Hecker, and by Father Elliott, a person so eminently, so peculiarly qualified—alike from his long and intimate association with the subject of the work, and by his acknowledged ability—needs no words of commendation. In his all too modest preface to the work Father Elliott tells us that his words are but the “hinges and latches” of the doors of the edifice built of Father Hecker’s journals, letters and recorded sayings. But he has done his work well and done it with a strength and clearness and honesty that makes it of far more than home-made quality. We are glad he has given so much space to the letters and recorded sayings of Father Hecker; for, after all, it is the truest form of biography. In one’s letters and sayings we see him as he was and not as he seemed to some well meaning but unreasoning admirer.

Few men of his generation held so unique a place in the thoughts and affections of both priests and people as did Father Hecker, a thing all the more to be wondered at when we consider the little promise of future greatness offered by his first beginnings in the priesthood. Long years before his death his name was a household word throughout the land—the synonym for priestly zeal, for breadth of thought, for intensest loyalty to the Holy See, for clearest understanding of the times and their needs. To the thousands who knew and loved Father Hecker, and to the other thousands who had come to know him from his writings, it will surely be the sweetest pleasure to read Father Elliott’s life of him. And what a life it was! From the beginning, from youngest manhood, earnest, high-principled and thoughtful; at an age, too, when most young men have not a thought for the serious wrestling with problems and thoughts of the gravest and most far reaching import. “He has said that often at night, when lying on the shavings before the oven in the bake-house, he would start up, roused in spite of himself by some great thought, and run out upon the wharves to look at the East river in the moonlight, or wander about under the spell of some restless aspiration. What does God desire from me? How shall I attain unto Him? What is it He has sent me into the world to do? These were the ceaseless questions of a heart that rested, meanwhile, in an unshaken confidence that time would bring the answer.”

Imagine him—as Father Elliott tells us—“Kneading at the dough-trough with Kant’s ‘Critique of Pure Reason’ fastened up on the wall before him, so that he might lose no time in merely manual labor. Fichte and Hegel succeeded Kant, all of them philosophers whose mother tongue was likewise his own and whose combined influence put him farther off than ever from the solution of that fundamental doubt, which constantly grew more perplexing and more painful. We find him (a young man) hiring a seat in the Unitarian Church of the Messiah where Orville Duvey was then preaching and walking every Sunday a distance of three miles from the foot of Rutgers street, “because he was a smart fellow and I enjoyed listening to him.” “Did I believe in Unitarianism? No; I believed in nothing.” All this, and in years but yet a boy. And but little more than a boy in years was he, when we find him joining that famous but short-lived community at Brook Farm. In a little while we see him at Fruitlands under the tutorship of Amos Bronson Alcott. Then in turn Pantheism, subjectivism, idealism, philanthropy were tried. “Theoretically and practically, Isaac Hecker loved humanity; to make men happy was his ever-renewed endeavor; was, in truth, the condition on which his own happiness depended. For years, this view of his life-task alternated with his search for exact answers to the questions his soul asked about man’s destiny hereafter; or, one might rather say, social questions and philosophical ones borrowed strength from each other to assail him till his heart throbbed and his brain whirled with the agony of the conflict.”

One by one he examined the Protestant sects, but in none of them did he find what his soul sought, “Not having had”—he wrote in the *Catholic World* for November, 1887—“personal and experimental knowledge of the Protestant denominations, I investigated them all, going from one of them to another—Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and all—conferring with their ministers and reading their books. It was a dreary business, but I did it. I knew transcendentalism well, and had been a radical socialist. All was found to be as above stated. Bronson’s ripe experience and my own thoroughly earnest investigation tallied perfectly. Indeed, the more you examine the Protestant sects in the light of first principles, the more they are found to weaken human certitude, interfere with reason’s native knowledge of God and His attributes, and perplex the free working of the laws of human thought. Protestantism is no religion for a philosopher, unless he is a pessimist—if you call such a being a philosopher—and adopts Calvinism.”

It was a toilsome journey, hardly to be appreciated by those of us born in the faith. But directed by his unerring instinct for the truth and aided by the ripe experience and masterly intellect of Bronson, who was linked to him by the closest bond of friendship, Father Hecker drew nearer step by step to the Church of Christ. “Do you really believe the Gospel?” about this time Bronson writes to him. “Do you really believe the Holy Catholic Church? If so, you must put yourself under the protection of the Church. I have commenced my preparations for uniting myself with the Catholic Church. I do not as yet belong to the family of Christ, I feel it, I can be an alien no longer, and without the Church I know, by my own past experience, that I cannot attain to purity and sanctity of life. I need the counsels, the aids, the chastisements and the consolations of the Chnrch. It is the appointed medium of salvation, and how can we hope for any good except through it?”

Of his entrance into the Church, of his subsequent trials, of his stu-

dent life, of his ordination and subsequent magnificent work as a priest, Father Elliott's work tells us clearly and beautifully. As a Paulist, he set himself a great and noble task. He has laid the foundation broad and deep, and the good work we are sure will go on. All that Archbishop Ireland says in his splendid and manly introduction, it gives us great pleasure to indorse.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL AND OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES;
consisting of an Introduction to each Epistle, an Analysis of each Chapter, a Paraphrase of the Sacred Text, and a Commentary, embracing Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Dogmatical, interspersed with moral reflections. By His Grace the *Most Rev. John MacEvilly, D.D.*, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1891. Benziger Brothers, Broadway, New York.

This Work has already passed through three large editions. It has also received the approval, successively of Popes Pius IX., and Leo XIII. The late Cardinal Wiseman expressed his opinion of it in terms of high commendation, as the following extract from his letter, shows :

"I have delayed acknowledging the receipt of the Work till . . . I could make myself acquainted with its contents. I have been able to do so to-day, and can, therefore, with better grace, thank you not merely for two elegant volumes, but for a solidly useful book. You have conferred a real, substantial benefit, not only on students in divinity, but on all Catholics speaking the English tongue. Your method is clear and complete, and you render the Sacred Text of a most difficult portion of Sacred Scripture intelligible where difficult, and practical where plain, so as to make its reading doubly profitable to learned and unlearned. I therefore, congratulate you most sincerely, for having undertaken and executed so good a work, and beg you to continue your useful and edifying labors."

The late illustrious Archbishop McHale wrote of it as follows :

"Together with a judicious Paraphrase of the Sacred Text, it embraces a full and satisfactory elucidation of its sense, and the varied Commentary, selected from the best interpreters of these Epistles, is interspersed with copious moral reflections.

"Such a work—useful to Clergy and Laity—has been hitherto much wanted in the English language ; and, aware of the mass of valuable information which the writer's talents, industry and familiarity with Biblical learning, have enabled him to diffuse through its pages, we feel much satisfaction in giving our sanction for its publication."

Such high and emphatic terms of commendation, setting forth so distinctly the characteristic features of the Work, and by such distinguished scholars, render needless any special commendation on our part. Accordingly, we turn our attention, rather, to a brief exposition of the plan and method of the Work.

The *plan* which the learned author has adopted, is that of the well-known commentary of Piconio, on the Epistles of St. Paul. Piconio's commentary, it is needless to say to scholarly students of Sacred Scripture, is confined to the Epistles of St. Paul and does not extend to the Catholic Epistles, which are included in this Work. Yet, it is well here to say, that in following the *plan* of Piconio, the author has not borrowed from him more than he has done from other learned commentators to whom he refers, from time to time, throughout his Work.

The *TEXT* is taken from the edition published by Duffy, Dublin, 1857, with the approval and under the sanction of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland. The author has carefully collated this text with that of the

Clementine Vulgate, with which he says it is "perfectly conformable, with some unimportant verbal exceptions," which he has corrected or mentioned in his Commentary.

In the PARAPHRASE, besides expressing the meaning of the text, the author points out the connection of the several parts, a task of no small difficulty, particularly as regards the Epistles of St. Paul, as every student of those Epistles well knows.

In the COMMENTARY, the author vindicates the correctness of his interpretation of his explanations of the connection, given in his Paraphrase. Before entering on the elucidation of the several words and phrases of the Sacred Text, he notices any differences of reading that exist between the Vulgate and the ordinary or received Greek Text, and points out the preponderance of authorities, both as regards the ancient Fathers and chief manuscripts, in favor of the Vulgate. In the quotations from the Old Testament, which are in many instances, according to the Septuagint—the version then principally in use—the author points out the differences of reading between it and the Vulgate, of the same Texts as translated or corrected by St. Jerome.

Though the learned author's chief object, as he notes it in his admirable Preface, is to elucidate the meaning of the Sacred Text, and to point out the doctrinal bearing of the several passages, yet as regards their *critical* portion, there is enough to satisfy the careful reader, that as regards this, the rules of sound Biblical criticism have been judiciously applied.

We warmly commend this Work as (to adopt the words of the late illustrious John, Archbishop of Tuam) "highly useful both to Clergy and Laity, and hitherto much wanted in the English language." Along with the learned writer's commentaries on the Gospels according to Saints Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, it furnishes a commentary upon almost the entire New Testament.

LA DOTTRINA DEL SIGNORE. Pei dodici Apostoli bandita alle genti, detta La Dottrina Dei Dodici Apostoli, versione note e commentario del *P. Ignazio M. Minasi, D.C. D.G.* Roma, Tipografia, A. Befana, 1891.

The diligent search that is being made of the libraries of the monasteries in the East, and the study of the manuscripts stored away among their treasures, are bringing to light constantly the most valuable documents hitherto unknown to the students of history and theology.

In the year 1883 Archbishop Philotheos Bryennios published a manuscript which he had discovered in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery at Constantinople. It formed a part of a collection which had been transcribed by a notary named Leo in 1056, who writes at the end of the work that he finished his task on Tuesday the 11th of June, 1056. The collection was made up of seven small works—all important—but there was one which had heretofore been wholly unknown to the world of letters. It was the fifth of the collection and entitled διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, otherwise, the Doctrine of the Lord promulgated by the Twelve Apostles to the nations. It was described under the first title by Archbishop Bryennios as far back as 1875. In 1889, Rev. Dr. Schaff published an English edition of the work, in which he gives a long list of authors who have written commentaries on the text and what each writer has furnished for its proper explanation. The work is valuable as throwing light on the New Testament and giving us a better idea of the constitution of the primitive Church.

In 1884 Scribner's Sons, of New York, published the text of the

"Teaching" edited with a translation, introduction, and notes by Roswell D. Hitchcock and Francis Brown, Professors in Union Theological Seminary. In their introduction, they declare the document genuine. It is cited by Clement of Alexandria, by Eusebius and Athanasius. It had been recognized by the learned that there must have been some document underlying both the Seventh Book of the "Apostolic Constitutions" and the "Apostolic Epitome." They attribute the work probably as far back as 120 A.D. They congratulate themselves on being able to present the work so promptly to the American public.

In his introduction the author speaks of the liturgical language of the Hellenist Jews; of the old paraphrases of this work and the citations made from it by the Fathers of the Church. He examines the question as to the date of its composition and concludes that it must have been written after the Gospel of St. Matthew, and before the others had been published and that the Apostles were its authors.

Our author publishes also the celebrated Hymn of Abericius, which he attributes to the middle of the second century, and the Christian Sacrifice described by the martyr, St. Justin, in order to show that the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles must be a more ancient work than either.

He gives us the text in Greek, with an Italian translation, enriched by copious notes. His commentary on the text takes up nearly two hundred and twenty-five pages. As an appendix the author gives a complete dictionary of all the Greek words used in the "Doctrine" with a full explanation of their meaning; an index of Scriptural citations; a general index of all the chapters and a special index *rerum*, so invaluable for every work which must be frequently consulted. Our author considers it entirely unnecessary to prove that such ancient documents as the Letter attributed to Barnabas, the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions and the Ecclesiastical Canons after the *præcepta dominica*, are simply paraphrases of this "Doctrine," and as being of much later date, must be used with caution in interpreting the same, because they were adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the times.

It is necessary to read and study the learned commentary of the author to understand what a flood of light is thrown on the manners and customs of the primitive Church, the prescribed fasts and prayers, the recognition of the first day of the week, called the Lord's day, the necessity of confession, the meaning of the phrase "breaking of bread," the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the origin of the Doxology, the character of the Liturgy, who could be present thereat, the choice of Bishops and Deacons. In the last chapter of the commentary the author shows that all the citations of the "Doctrine" are taken from the Gospel of St. Matthew: that it is always called *the* Gospel; he answers the objections that might be urged that there are in the "Doctrine" certain allusions to texts taken from the Gospel of St. Luke; and his conclusion is that the work must therefore have been written almost immediately after the Gospel of St. Matthew. Theological students and all lovers of Church history must thank Father Minasi for the publication of this learned and exhaustive treatise.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR. By *Edwin Carl Bissel*, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. The Hartford Theological Seminary, 1891, pp. ix., 134, price, \$1.75.

Hebrew is generally regarded by those uninitiated in Semitic languages as a very difficult study. Its weird characters and peculiar structure, so

different from that of Western tongues, give it an air of mystery. Yet a little insight into its principles and material shows that it is, if not the easiest, certainly one of the easiest of languages to master. Its difficulty is trifling compared with that of Greek, Latin or German. Grammarians, however, seem to make it as hard to enter as the tomb of Abraham, over which the Moslem keeps such jealous watch and ward. Let the student who would not be repelled from making acquaintance with the sacred language, avoid at the start Gesenius, or any of his recent German and English editors. These will do to clear up many a point after he has gained some facility in reading the Old Testament. If he knows Latin he will find, we believe, no better, clearer, simpler guide than Slaughter's "Grammatica Hebraica" as amended by Castellini, *quondam* professor of Arabic in the Roman College, and still later revised by Bargès, professor of Hebrew in the Paris Academy; published by Maisonneuve. Mons. Corcoran, no mean authority on this subject, thought very highly of this as an introductory grammar. He used it for many years as a text in his classes, and was wont in playful way to style it *beata illa Grammatica*. Next to it the beginner will find Chabot's "Grammaire Hébraïque Élémentaire" (3d edition), or Senepin's book with the same French title, or Dr. Gabriel's English translation of Vosen-Kaulen's "Rudiments," of excellent service. These three are published by Herder, St. Louis. They are simple and sufficiently full to introduce the student to easy translation of the Old Testament.

Midway between these elementary books, and the more erudite treatises, based on Gesenius, we would place the admirable work of Professor Bissel. Fuller in detail than the former, it is less intricate than the latter. It is eminently what it claims to be—a *practical* grammar. Its completeness, yet compactness of material, with its apparatus of exercises, vocabularies, notes, illustrations, references; its perfect method; its accuracy and neatness of print, make it a model text for the classroom. Especially praiseworthy is the make-up of its vocabularies, which comprise the words most frequently used in the Hebrew Bible. "All words used in the Hebrew Bible over fifty times, the most of those used between twenty-five and fifty times, and not a few of those, of connected roots, used less than twenty-five times, are here found, and they are the only Hebrew words employed in the book." (b. I.). The rules and principles of the grammar are so made to bear on this important vocabulary that the pupil, whilst learning theory, is ever reducing it to practice, and is at the same time storing in memory the words which will introduce him to early and easy reading of the Old Testament. Moreover, by a unique disposition of the vocabulary, he is helped to a fair insight into Hebrew etymology and synomy. Professor Bissell's grammar is introductory only in a qualified sense. For students who have mastered a more elementary book, it will be aptly introductory to a more extended, more scientific work. In the hands of a master like its author it will doubtless answer even for beginners. But for private study or for use by a less skilled teacher, a simpler grammar we think were desirable. This we judge from a comparison between it and the books mentioned above, on the classification and changes of the vowel points, on the prefixes, and on the verb. Still, the value of an introductory grammar must be judged by the point first to be gained. If the aim be to equip the student as quickly as possible with the essentials of a language and then send him to grow into its spirit by the use of dictionary and reference grammar—and this is our standard—the easier and simpler, if adequate to the purpose, the better the introductory book. If, on the other hand, the aim be to strengthen the pupil with a more

thorough grasp of the detailed structure of a language before entering at large on the work of constant translation, then we doubt if there can be found a more available grammar than the one before us.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS per modum conferentiarum, auctore clarissimo. *P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F.* Novis curis edidit *P. F. Irenaeus Bierbaum, O. S. F.* Paderbonæ. 1891, Ex Typographia Bonifaciana, Benziger Bros. New York, Four parts, I., II., III., IV.

Father Benjamin Elbel of the Order of Friars Minor died June 4, 1756. His "Moral Conferences, or Moral Theology," proposed in the form of practical cases, passed through many editions even during the author's life-time—an excellent sign of its worth and popularity. Father Bierbaum takes as the text of the present work, the fifth edition as revised and amended by Elbel himself in 1751. He publishes it entire, although in some cases, the changes which have taken place in the civil law, make such parts useful only as illustrations of the doctrines proposed. Such solutions of cases as have been modified by recent decisions of the Apostolic See are all noted and corrected, the correction being marked in the text by an asterisk preceding and following such correction. He has carefully verified all the citations from other authors made by Elbel, and quotes the editions of those authors which he has so examined.

Although this "Moral Theology" is proposed in the form of conferences or practical cases, it must not be inferred that he neglects the full explanation of all the principles of Moral Science. These principles are clearly and scientifically set forth at the beginning of each chapter. Then follow a number of cases in which we behold the application of such principles.

Who that has studied Moral Theology in the pages of Voit, a textbook in common use some fifty years ago, has not been charmed with the cases proposed? Voit did but follow in the footsteps of Elbel.

As to the rank of Elbel as a moral theologian it is enough for us to say that St. Alphonsus makes most frequent use of his authority in his theology.

Gury says of him in his "Commentary on Moral Theologians;" "he excels in sound and clean-cut doctrine and in the explanation and solution of practical cases." Müller says "he excels in soundness of doctrine and in copious practical cases." Hurter, that "he is a weighty authority on morals and a probabilist;" and Lehmkuhl, whose opinion is of the highest authority, affirms that "he deserves to be numbered amongst the classic and principal writers on Moral Theology."

Clear, practical and scientific—these are the chief merits of the work, and the syllogistic form in which most of the solutions are given adds a special grace for the student.

Part I. is on human acts, conscience, law and sin. Part II. on faith, hope, charity and religion. Part III. on the second, third and fourth precepts of the Decalogue, and the first three precepts of the Church. These three parts form the first volume. Part IV. comprises the last six precepts of the Decalogue.

The work is printed on excellent paper, and with fine type, a credit to the publisher. Our readers will thank us for calling their attention to this new edition of an author they have seen so often quoted, but whose work has long since been out of print and almost inaccessible to the theological student. Vives gave us a reprint of Lacroix some years ago. We are grateful to Father Bierbaum for this reprint of Elbel.

DIE SENTENZEN ROLANDS, nachmals Papstes Alexander III., zum ersten Male herausgegeben von P. Fr. Ambrosius M. Gietl, O. Pr. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder: St. Louis. \$3.20.

A valuable contribution to the history of dogma. In his preface, Father Gietl declares that the discovery of this precious manuscript, now published for the first time, is due to Father Henry Denifle, sub-archivist of the Holy See. The labor inseparable from its publication, the verification of the many citations, was undertaken at his instigation. For a proper appreciation of these Sentences of Roland, the author was forced to introduce much of the theology of that period, especially the teaching of Abelard and Omnidene. We may say, that these Sentences of Roland, with those of Peter Lombard, led up to and found their perfection and fitting conclusion in the "Summa" of St. Thomas.

In a learned introduction of sixty-five pages, the author proves, from extrinsic and intrinsic reasons, that the writer of these Sentences can be no other than Rolandus Bandinelius, who, in 1159, became Pope under the name of Alexander III.; that they were, most probably, written by him after his elevation to the cardinalate, and before he became Chancellor of the Holy See, therefore, about the year 1150; he treats of the theology of Roland, and that of Abelard, of Hugo of St. Victor, and of Omnidene; of Roland's method of teaching in general, but especially on the Sacrament of Matrimony; in conclusion, he shows that the manuscript belongs to the thirteenth century, and gives a minute description of the same.

The text of the Sentences, with explanatory notes of the author, takes up three hundred and twenty-two pages, and embraces the whole field of theology, with the exception of the Sacrament of Orders and *de novissimis*. The most subtle and curious questions are asked in each treatise, then answered, and objections urged and refuted. For one unacquainted with the writings of the old scholastics, these Sentences of Roland, showing as they do the style of teaching theology in the middle ages, must be both interesting and most instructive. It is clear that Roland did not make use of the Sentences of the great master, Peter Lombard, whose work must have appeared at about the same time. The learned world will be grateful to Father Gietl for this valuable publication.

EIN CYCLUS CHRISTOLOGISCHER GEMÄELDE, aus der Katakombe der Heiligen Petrus und Marcellinus zum erstenmal herausgegeben und erläutert. Von Joseph Wilpert, mit 9 Tafeln in Lichtdruck. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. \$3.30.

Only a few months ago we called the attention of our readers to the superb work of Joseph Wilpert on the Paintings of the Catacombs and their old copies. Now this diligent disciple of de Rossi gives us another royal work on the paintings of our Divine Lord found in the Catacombs of SS. Peter and Marcellinus. He takes the paintings found in room 54 of these Catacombs, those of the ceiling and walls, viz., the Star, the Annunciation of the Archangel to Mary and the Three Magi on the ceiling; and the cures of the woman with the bloody flux, of the man with dropsy, of the man born blind, of the leper, and Christ and the Samaritan woman at the well.

He gives a full explanation of all these paintings, showing us what wonderful things lie hidden in the Catacombs of Rome awaiting the diligent explorer and student.

He adds a chapter on the end or intention of the Catacomb paintings

and principally on the remembrance of and prayers for the dead. We will give only one of those quoted by Wilpert from the end of the second or beginning of the third century.

Vos Precor O Fratres, Orare Huc Quando Venitis.
Et Precibus, Totis, Patrem, Natumque Rogatis,
Sit, Vestrae, Mentis, Agapes, Caraem, Meminisse.
Ut Deus, Omnipotens, Agapen In Saecula Servet.

"Brethren, when you come here to pray and in the common prayer call on the Father and the Son, I beseech you remember dear Agape that Almighty God may preserve Agape forever."

It makes one's heart rejoice to go over such works as this, and Herder brings them out in a style worthy of the subject and the paintings. Print and illustrations are truly magnificent.

We are sure that Wilpert will give us more of his invaluable studies of the Catacombs and Herder should receive every encouragement as the publisher of these editions.

DON GABRIEL GARCIA MORENO, PRAESIDENT DER REPUBLIK ECUADOR. Ein Lebensbild, nach historischen Quellen entworfen von *Amara George-Kaufmann*, Freiburg im Breisgau. Herdersche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$1.00.

A new volume of the biographical series of remarkable characters in history published by Herder, the great printer of Germany. Garcia Moreno was born in Guayaquil, December 24, 1821, died by the assassin's hand August 6, 1875, whilst filling the Presidential chair of Ecuador for the second time. His life was devoted to God and his country, to faith and fatherland, to religion and civilization, to the greater glory and advancement of the Church and the State. He died a martyr to duty. His greatest honor was to seal with his blood, the truth he had always defended by work and deed. One of the band of murderers cried out as he dealt him a fatal wound: "Die, destroyer of liberty." Moreno was heard to answer: "Dios no meure;" "God does not die." Truly in his case, the blood of the martyr has been the seed of Christians. Ecuador has shaken off the yoke of the secret societies. The public authorities solemnly dedicated the Republic to the Sacred Heart of our Lord. Religion is no longer persecuted; and the name of Gabriel Garcia Moreno is held in veneration by the whole people. The life of such a man must be inspiring. There are too few heroes in this nineteenth century to allow any of them to be forgotten and Moreno was a true Christian hero. As a youth and a man, in private life and public, as a practical Catholic and a statesman, his life is full of lessons for us.

In English we have an excellent biography of Moreno translated by Lady Herbert from the French of Father P. A Berthe, Redemptorist, and published by Burns & Oates, London.

In this life by George-Kaufmann, in German, every work heretofore published, whether in Europe or in Ecuador, has been utilized to make it as complete and accurate as possible. The work is enriched by an admirable portrait of Garcia Moreno and an excellent map of West Ecuador.

LEBENSBLAETTER. ERINNERUNGEN AUS DER SCHULWELT. Von Dr. L. Kellner, etc., mit dem Bilde des Verfassers. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$1.65

We have in this work a valuable contribution to the history of Pedagogy in Germany. Dr. Kellner, an old Catholic schoolmaster and school in-

spector, give us his autobiography. After an introduction of thirty pages he gives us his own work as a school teacher, beginning in 1831 and continues his memoirs down to 1886. It is a history of the progress of education in Germany during fifty years. The book is full of the most valuable information for educators. We will give only one extract which is most pertinent to our own day. Speaking of a conference of teachers he attended in 1848, he says he came away from it with the conviction that the school had become a part of politics and that pedagogy and politics had at last been inseparably united. "I did not conceal from myself that thereby a new living element had been introduced into the school and amongst teachers, but at the same time I could not get rid of the fear that thereby true human culture could be endangered and that the end of such a mastery over the school might sooner or later lead to one-sidedness and might oppress and injure free, ideal human activity." He quotes Schleirmacher's conclusion: "Where a government asserts its pretensions against the religious sentiment (of a people) in order to uphold the political, their various relations will be troubled in many ways, . . . division steps in, not only between the family and the Church, but also between families and the State, between Church and State as regards their influence in education." And stronger still the testimony of Dahlmann: "No State has ever, without inflicting injury on the best portion of its people, claimed the children as its own, to train them according to its pleasure for State ends, without regard to self-determination on their part according to environment and choice."

POMBAL. SEIN CHARAKTER AND SEINE POLITIK. Von Bernhard Duhr, S. J. 61c.
JESUITEN-FABELN. Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte. Erste und zweite
Lieferung. Bernhard Duhr, S. J. Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlags-
handlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. 25c. each.

The first brochure on Pombal, the great persecutor of the Jesuits, is one of the series of noteworthy appendices or pamphlets issued by the staff of the famous German-Catholic magazine "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach." The second, Jesuiten-Fabeln, are the first two numbers of a most important work of Father Duhr, in which he will treat of the more common stock objections urged against the Jesuit's by their enemies. We give a list of those thus far discussed: 1. Ignatius of Loyola established the Jesuit Order for the destruction of Protestantism. 2. The revelation of the general confession of the Empress Maria Theresa. 3. The poisoning of Pope Clement XIV. 4. The Monita Secreta, or the secret rules of the Society of Jesus. 5. The blameworthy system of education of the Jesuits. 6. The Jesuits were the real instigators of the Thirty Years' War in Germany. 7. The blasphemous profession of faith of the Jesuits, or the Bohemian-Hungarian oath. 8. The Jesuit Camarilla at the Court of James II. 9. St. Bartholomew's night, a horrible orgie of the Jesuitical spirit. 10. On the obligation of committing sin.

As in Pombal, so also in these fabulous stories against the Jesuits, the author has made use of all the light thrown on his subject by the latest historical researches, and especially by the secret archives of the various courts of Europe, which only in our time have been accessible to the student. No doubt these contributions to history will soon be translated into English. They deserve it. The history of the Church is only beginning to be studied, and the more this field is diligently tilled the more unmistakably will the divinity of the Church be manifested to the world.

GREGORY X. UND RUDOLF VON HABSBURG, in ihren beiderseitigen Beziehungen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Frage über die Grundsätzliche Stellung von *Sacerdotium* und *Imperium* in jener Zeit nebst einigen Beiträgen zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Reiches. Von Dr. A. Zisterer, Repetent am Wilhelmsstift zu Tübingen. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder: St. Louis. \$1.15.

A historical disquisition on two remarkable personages of the thirteenth century. Clement IV. died at Viterbo in November, 1268. For nearly three years, owing to dissensions amongst the cardinals, the Holy See remained vacant. Divided as they were, into French and Italian, they could not agree on a Roman Pontiff. At last, the kings of France and Sicily came themselves to Viterbo to secure harmony and obtain an election. It was at last agreed amongst the cardinals that the choice of a pope should be left to six of their number. On the 1st of September, 1271, Theobald Visconti of Piacenza, Archdeacon of Liege, was chosen Pope. Well versed in secular affairs, the new Pope bent all his energies to secure unity amongst the Christian nations of Europe, thus to inaugurate a new crusade against the Moslem power, which was a constant threat to Christian civilization. He strove to reconcile the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. He insisted, also, on the election of an Emperor by the Electors of Germany, under severe penalties in case of refusal. Rudolph of Hapsburg was chosen Emperor. In furtherance of his one great design, the Pope called together the great Ecumenical Council of Lyons, in 1273, for the union of the Latin and Greek churches. Gregory died at Arezzo, on the 10th of January, 1276.

Our author gives an account of the election of Gregory X., his life and character; of the choice of Rudolph of Hapsburg as Emperor; the relation of the Pope to that election, and his final confirmation of the election; and the relation established thereby between the Church and the Empire.

THE WILL OF GOD IN TRIALS, DIFFICULTIES, AND AFFLICTIONS. By J. Hillegeer, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1891.

In his beautiful life of that great and spiritual man, Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Congregation, Father Elliott tells us that, during the last ten years of that life—years of constant suffering and sickness—“next to the Scriptures, no book served him so well during his illness as “Abandonment, or Entire Surrender to Divine Providence,” a small posthumous treatise of Father P. F. Caussade, S. J., edited and published by Father H. Ramière, S. J. He used it incessantly when in great trouble of mind, and knew it almost by heart. His copy of it was thumbed all to pieces.”

This little book of Father Hillegeer, S. J., on the same subject, should receive a hearty welcome. As the translator tells us in his short preface, “the author constantly makes his appeal to reason, based upon fundamental Christian truths, rather than to sentiment. He, therefore, finds comfort for the tried soul in the reasonable act, as deduced from the truths of Revelation. . . . In other words, in this brief volume the soldier of the Cross is held up for imitation.”

Nothing happens without a Cause. We must recognize in all Things the Providence of God. In Time of Adversity we should put our Trust in God. How God manifests His Providence, especially towards Sinners and the Impious. Why it is that many complain of the ways of Divine Providence. He who recognizes the powerful hand of God in all things, is satisfied with all that may happen. Out of evil God brings

good, etc. Such are the opening chapters of the work. The closing chapters are on Patience, and are full of consolation for all kinds of sufferers. An excellent little work, and worthy of all commendation.

MATHIAS CORVINUS, KOENIG VON UNGARN, 1458-1490. Auf Grund archivalischer Forschungen bearbeitet von Dr. Wilhelm Fraknói Tit. Bischof, zweiter Präsdent der Ungar. Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Translation from the Hungarian with portrait, 48 illustrations and 8 *fac similes*). Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$2.75.

This is a most valuable historical study. When the name of Corvinus, Ruler of Hungary, is mentioned, we think only of John Corvinus Hunyady, the Christian hero, who for twenty years defended Christian Europe against the attacks of the Turks, and who died twenty days after his great victory over Mohammed before the walls of Belgrade. Fifty thousand Turks perished in that battle and Hungary was saved from the Moslem yoke. He left two sons, Ludislaus and Matthias, and one daughter, Beatrice.

Matthias succeeded to the throne of Hungary in 1458. He was born February 23, 1440, elected King of Hungary, January 24, 1458, and died April 6, 1490. The learned author cites no less than eighty-eight authorities made use of in the composition of his work, not to mention the archives of Bamberg, Berlin, Budapest, Dresden, Florence, Milan, Mantua, Modena, Munich, Paris, Prague, Rome, Venice and Vienna.

It is needless to dwell on the importance of such a work, taking in, as it does, the last half of the fifteenth century. Bishop Fraknói is well known to the literary world by his life of Bishop John Witez and the Hungarian Nunciature of Cardinal Carvajal, 1456-1461, both written in Hungarian; and the political addresses of Bishop Witez, with the letters of the great Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini addressed to that Bishop; and the letters of Matthias Corvinus, sent to the Roman Pontiffs, 1458-1490; written in Latin. His last work now translated into German, increases the debt of gratitude to this learned Bishop and scholar.

DIE XIV. STATIONEN DES HEILIGEN KREUZWEGS nach compositionen der Malerschule des Klosters Beuron, mit einleitendem und erklärendem Text von Dr. Paul Keppler. Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$3.00.

Fourteen grand plates of the Stations of the Cross painted for St. Mary's Church, in Stuttgart, by the religious of the Benedictine Monastery of Beuron. This is a new school of painting which had its origin about the year 1870. Fra Angelico, the greatest of pre-Raphaelite painters, if not the greatest of all ideal or spiritual painters, is evidently its master. Overbeck amongst modern painters is clearly one of its models. The school is neither Gothic, Roman or Renaissance, Italian, Spanish, French, German or Dutch. It is a new school imitating the classic severity of the pagan Romans and the lovely spirituality of the painter of Fiesole. Lovers of Christian art will be delighted to possess these grand copies of the Stations of the Cross. The same Monks of Beuron carried out the decorations of the great monastery of Monte Cassino, in Italy, and the paintings in the monastery of Emaus, in Prague, and Maredsous, in Belgium. All their work is instinctively religious, elevating, instructive. By their paintings they strive to make men devout, to lead them to pray—in a word, their paintings preach; the only end of all religious art.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION. By *Judge Edmund F. Dunne*. Catholic Truth Society. No. 2. St. Louis. 1891.

We do not intend to review the line of argument of the learned Judge. Those interested in this question, and it is the most living question of our day and for our people, ought to read the pamphlet and study it thoroughly.

1. We simply state that we ourselves have as yet never been able to see how the State has any right to *educate* at all. It is one thing, to enable parents to educate their children, to furnish the poor with the means necessary for such an education; and a different thing to claim the right *itself* to educate. The State ought to help the poor to educate their children, but it will be difficult to prove that such help implies the right to educate *all* children.

2. Except in case of those, entirely abandoned by their natural protectors and who therefore would become a danger to society, we cannot see how there can be any ground for compulsory instruction.

3. As Americans we are absolutely opposed to "Paternalism" on the part of the government.

These principles as being the legislation of our Plenary Councils and of the Popes, we will uphold until the proper authorities declare them wrong.

THE GOOD CHRISTIAN: OR SERMONS ON THE CHIEF CHRISTIAN VIRTUES. In seventy-six sermons. Adapted to all the Sundays and most of the holy days of the year, with a full index of all the sermons, an alphabetical index of the principal subjects treated and copious marginal notes. By the Rev. *Father Francis Hunolt*, Priest of the Society of Jesus and preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne 1740, by the Rev. *J. Allen, D.D.*, Chaplain of the Dominican Convent of the Sacred Heart, King Williamstown and of the Dominican Convent, East London, South Africa. Volumes I. and II. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1891.

To most English speaking clergy Hunolt is a name well known and respected. Few are there of them who have not read and profited by his sermons as translated by Father Allen. The volume before us, will, we are sure, meet with a warm and generous welcome. They comprise seventy-six sermons and treat of the chief Christian virtues. They are a library in themselves, and to many and many a hard-working priest who has not the time for continued study and prolonged meditation, will prove of highest value. They are, moreover, eminently practical sermons and suited to any state or condition. The author seeks not to preach himself, but his Divine Master. They are solid and learned productions and at the same time highly devotional. Every priest should have them in his library.

ST. IGNATIUS AND THE EARLY JESUITES. By *Stewart Rose*. Catholic Publication Society, New York, 1891.

This is unquestionably a scholarly work, and it is, at the same time, a most valuable addition to our Catholic literature in the English language. The author has collected his materials with excellent good judgment from all the most authentic sources, and has given to the public, in simple yet elegant style, an able biography of that great and providential man, St. Ignatius of Loyola, containing all that is most interesting and instructive to the reading public of him and his companions. The illustrations are antique in style; they are faithful reproductions of originals two centuries old, made by skilful artists. While the originals

do not, as samples of engraving, equal the best specimens of modern art, yet they serve their purpose admirably well of carrying the reader's mind back vividly to the period contemporaneous with the persons and the events described in the book. The author surely merits many thanks for the service he has rendered to the Catholic public, and no library should be without his excellent work.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. For the Use of Sunday-School Teachers and Advanced Classes. By *Rev. Thomas L. Kinkead*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

This book is a very valuable adjunct to the "Baltimore" Catechism, that is, the Catechism prepared and published in accordance with the action of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. It is no disparagement of the Baltimore Catechism to say that its questions and answers need to be explained in order to make them intelligible to the greater number of the children in our Sunday and parochial schools. We know of no catechism of which a like remark may not be made.

The book before us therefore, aims at supplying a want which, whether it be felt or not, certainly exists. And this laudable purpose, the author has very successfully accomplished. The Catechism is preserved complete and distinct of itself. It may be used either with or without the explanations. The explanations are clear, practical and simple. They are always pertinent and withal are so interesting as regards both matter and form that we should suppose the book would be in demand by adults for their own use. We heartily recommend it.

EIN BESUCH AM LA PLATA. Von *P. Ambros Schupp, S.J.* Mit 38 Illustrationen. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. Herder. St. Louis. \$1.75.

Father Schupp gives us an account of his vacation trip from Porto Alegre, in the province of Rio Grande do Sul, or southern Brazil, to Montevideo, in Uruguay, and Buenos Ayres, on the Rio de la Plata. Besides a description of the countries, cities, inhabitants, of churches, colleges, and public buildings, as a priest he naturally speaks of the religious condition of the various places he visits. Incidentally, he gives a brief history of Uruguay and Buenos Ayres down to the present day. There are thirty-eight maps and illustrations, all model pictures. The churches, schools, colleges, and public buildings, shown in phototype, prove that those cities of South America keep fully in step with the progress of the nineteenth century. The cathedral, and the church of St. Felicitas, in Buenos Ayres, must be as fine buildings as are found in any city of the New World.

TOM PLAYFAIR; OR MAKING A START. By *Francis J. Finn, S.J.*, author of "Percy Wynn," "Harry Dee," etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

"Tom Playfair" is an introduction to "Percy Wynn." Those who read the latter work will, we are sure, procure this also. It is a strong, healthy, moral book for boys. Full of exciting incidents, still everything is just as might have happened amongst small boys at a Jesuit school. Tom, it is true, is rather precocious for a boy of ten years, but the author's design of showing the formation of character and the overcoming of faults in a boy, is skilfully carried out. He thoroughly un-

derstands boy-nature and every boy who reads his book must be influenced for good by the reading.

"Tom Playfair" and "Percy Wynn" ought to be favorite premium books for schools and would be excellent holiday gifts for the younger and even for older boys. Parents also might read the stories with great profit.

PATER DAMIAN DER HELD VON MOLOKAI MIT DREI ABBILDUNGEN UND EINEM KAERTCHEN. Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. 40 cents.

The readers of the QUARTERLY are already familiar with the life of the Saintly Martyr of Charity, Father Damien, from the admirable article of Mrs. Teeling in our Oct., 1890, number. His name has become famous all the world over and is revered by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. "Greater love than this no man hath than that he lay down his life for his friends." A good motto for this beautiful little life in German published by Herder. The work is enriched by a good portrait of Damien, a picture of his house and chapel and of the leper colony, besides an excellent little map of the Hawaii or Sandwich Islands, one of which is Molokai, the scene of Father Damien's labors, the home of the lepers.

DAS KLEID DES HERRN AUF DEN FRUECHRISTLICHEN DENKMÄLERN. Von A. de Waal, mit 2 Tafeln und 21 Textbildern. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. 95 cents.

An archaeological study suggested by the late exposition of the Holy Coat of our Divine Lord at Treves. The author treats of the clothing of our Lord as represented, whether in painting, sculpture or metal-work in the earliest ages of the Church; of the earliest pictures of the Crucifixion; of the division of the garments made by the Roman soldiers and their casting dice for the seamless robe. The work is handsomely illustrated with two phototypes and twenty-one wood cuts.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Tobias Mullen, Bishop of Erie. Fr. Pustet & Co. 1892.

This work was not received until all the matter for this number of the REVIEW was in type, and all but the last form printed, or passing through the press. Consequently, we are only able to acknowledge its receipt and to say, from a cursory glance at it, that it appears to be a very full and comprehensive discussion of the important subject it treats, and will be especially useful to persons who are unable to consult existing Latin works on the same subject.

MITTELALTERLICHE KIRCHENFESTE UND KALENDARIEN IN BAYERN. Von Dr. Anton Lechner, Domkapitular in München. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche, Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. \$2.00.

This work on the festivals of the Church and the Church calendars of the Middle Ages in Bavaria embraces the period from the tenth to the fifteenth century. It is divided into six parts, devoted to the Church-feasts and Calendars of the Dioceses of Freising, Salzburg, Passau, Regensburg, Augsburg and a Monastery Calendar. To the liturgical and antiquarian student it is a work of special interest.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM, WHICH? Controversial Letters in Answer to the Above Question, and in Vindication of the Position assigned by the Catholic Church to the Ever-Blessed Mother of the World's Redeemer in the Divine Economy of Man's Salvation. In Reply to the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdom, Coadjutor (Anglican) Bishop of Fredericktown, New Brunswick. By *Richard F. Quigley, LL.B.* Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This book, which is a volume of 471 pages, was fully and favorably noticed in the April number of the REVIEW, in 1891.

EXPLICACION DEL CATECISMO ABREVIADO DE LA DOCTRINA CRISTIANA. Traducion por el Canonigo Doctor *D. J. Schmitt*, por *Bernardo Augusto Thiel*, Obispo de Costa-Rica. Segunda Edicion. Friburgo, en Brisgovia. B. Herder. 1891. \$1.35.

This is a Spanish translation of Dr. Schmitt's celebrated catechism in German, made by the Bishop of Costa-Rica, and warmly commended by the Archbishop of Granada. It is another evidence of the enterprise and energy of the great printing-house of B. Herder.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[A number of the books mentioned under this head were received too late for careful examination. The mention of their titles here does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers of the REVIEW.]

BETTER THAN GOLD. By *Nugent Robinson*. Notre Dame, Indiana: "Ave Maria" Press.

THE CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS. By *Lelia Hardin Bugg*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

SIMPLICITY IN PRAYER. By the author of "Les Petites Fleurs." From the French. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS DE GERONIMO, OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. By *A. M. Clarke*, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII. 1892. A Clero Provinciarum, S. Ludovici, Milwaukeeensis, Chicagiensis, Sanctae Fidei et S. Pauli. St. Louis: B. Herder. 50c.

CHRISTMAS-TIDE. By *Eliza Allen Starr*, author of "Patron Saints," "Pilgrims and Shrines," etc., etc. Published by the author, 299 Huron Street, Chicago.

LOVE AND FORGIVENESS. Reflections suggested by "The Greatest Thing in the World." Translated from the German. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1891.

SIMPLICITY, WOUNDED FEELINGS, WEARINESS IN WELL DOING; A TASTE FOR READING. By *Rev. Frederick William Faber, D.D.* New York: James Potts & Co.

ON CHRISTIAN ART. By *Edith Healey*. With an Introduction by *Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1892.

CHRIST OUR TEACHER. Translated from the French of *Father J. B. St. Jure, S.J.* With an Introduction by His Eminence, *James Cardinal Gibbons*. Baltimore: McCauley & Kilner.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII, tam pro Clero Sæculari Statuum Fœderatorum quam pro iis quibus Kalendarium Clero Romano Proprium concessum est. 1892. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

BIRTH-DAY SOUVENIR, OR DIARY, WITH A SUBJECT OF MEDITATION, OR A PRAYER FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. By Mrs. A. E. Buchanan. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By O. S. J. Based on the German translation of *Rev. August Meer*. By Very Rev. Boniface F. Verheyen, O. S. B. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

HELP FOR THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY. Prayers and devotions in aid of the Suffering Souls. By Joseph Ackermann. Edited by Rev. F. B. Luebbermann. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

PLATONS APOLOGIE DES SOKRATES. Von G. H. Müller. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. H. Herder, St. Louis. 25 cents. Greek text, with dictionary of words and meaning in German.

THE HOLY MASS EXPLAINED. A Short Explanation of the Meaning of the Ceremonies of the Mass; Useful to all who take part in the Sacred Mysteries. By Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S. J. *Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

MEDITATIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF RELIGION, and on the Hidden and Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Most Rev. Dr. Kirby, Archbishop of Ephesus, Rector of the Irish College at Rome. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1892.

THE LITTLE ALTAR BOY'S MANUAL. Instructions for Serving at Mass, Vespers, Benediction, etc., with the proper Responses. With Prayers at Mass, Morning and Evening Prayers, etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

THE LIFE OF THE BLESSED ANGELINA OF MARSCIANO, VIRGIN. Promotress of the Third Regular Order of St. Francis of Assisi. Compiled from Ancient Documents by the Honorable Mrs. A. Montgomery. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

THE INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY Translated from the French of the Rev. J. Grou, of the Society of Jesus. Edited, with a biographical sketch and preface, by Rev. S. H. Frisbee, S. J. In two volumes. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

CONTEMPLATIONS AND MEDITATIONS OF THE HIDDEN LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, according to the Method of St. Ignatius. Translated from the French by a Sister of Mercy. Revised by Rev. W. H. Eyre, S. J. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

PSALLITE SAPIENTER. "Psalliret weise!" Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie, von Dr. Maurus Wolter, O. S. B. Erzabt von St Martin zu Beuron. Zweite Auflage Freiburg von Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder: St. Louis. 2. vols. \$5.50.

PERIODICAL

70750

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

**THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**

